





74



BX 5071 .L4 1880 v.1
Lee, Frederick George, 1832-
1902.
The church under Queen
Elizabeth



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015



THE CHURCH

UNDER

QUEEN ELIZABETH.

Beati pacifici.



“IN the whole carriage of This Work I have assumed unto myself the freedom of a just historian; concealing nothing out of fear, nor speaking anything for favour; delivering nothing for a Truth without good authority; but so delivering that Truth as to witness for me that I am neither biassed by love or hatred, nor overswayed by partiality and corrupt affections.”—Peter Heylyn, D.D.



Fide et constantia.

THE CHURCH UNDER QUEEN ELIZABETH.

An Historical Sketch.

BY

THE REV. FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D.D.

VICAR OF ALL SAINTS', LAMBETH.;

AUTHOR OF "HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF THE REFORMATION,"
ETC., ETC.

VOLUME THE FIRST.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION ON
"THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH."

"That bright Occidental Star, Queen Elizabeth, of most
happy memory."—*The Epistle Dedicatory of King
James's version of the Bible.*

LONDON:

W. H. ALLEN AND CO.

13, WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL, S.W.

1880.

“Coming nearer home, he said that England had lost the perfection of the unity of Faith and the unity of the Church; but though not a Catholic people it was Christian still. Taken in its millions it was a baptized people. Through the neglect and sin of fathers and mothers, multitudes grew up without baptism; but the English people still believed in Revelation, in the coming of Jesus Christ into the World as the Saviour of men, and in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God.”—H. E. Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster. (1879.)

“I will say that battered as is that old hull [the Church of England], it is a great breakwater between the raging waves of Infidelity and Catholic Truth in this land; that it has held so long together, under so many disadvantages and difficulties, must be a work of Divine Providence for some great end which remains to be developed.”—Augustus Welby Pugin. (1853.)

“Doubtless the National Church has hitherto been a serviceable breakwater against doctrinal errors more fundamental than its own. How long this will last in the years now before us, it is impossible to say: for the Nation drags down its Church to its own level.”—H. E. John Henry Cardinal Newman. (1864.)

“Let only Catholics co-operate with their Anglican brethren, and Anglicans co-operate with Catholics, for the restoration of mutual and Corporate Unity: for the triumph of Catholic Truth, not for the destruction of anything that men hold and cling to as the outward and living form of their visible existence; and the glorious result, which every good man must wish for, and which none but evil men would deprecate, will soon crown our mutual and combined efforts.”—Ambrose L. M. P. De Lisle. (1857.)

TO ALL
WHO ARE PREPARED TO LOOK OUR DIFFICULTIES
AS ENGLISH CHURCHMEN FAIRLY IN THE FACE ;
AND WHO,
HAVING REALIZED THEM, ARE ENDEAVOURING,
IN A CONSERVATIVE SPIRIT AND BY A REASONABLE METHOD,
TO OVERCOME THEM ;
THE GENEROUS, THE SELF-SACRIFICING, THE ZEALOUS,
FRIENDS, KNOWN AND UNKNOWN,
ABROAD AND AT HOME,
LABOURING,
IN THE FAITH AND FEAR OF GOD, AND ON
NO SANDY FOUNDATION,
FOR
CORPORATE REUNION,
THESE VOLUMES
ARE RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED,
IN THE HOPE, WITH A BLESSING FROM ON HIGH,
OF
RESTORED PEACE AND VISIBLE UNITY,
UNDER THE PATERNAL RULE OF
THE PRIMATE OF CHRISTENDOM.

“The Reformation, no doubt, cost much. It broke up the Visible Unity so dear to Christians who believe our Lord’s universal prayer in St. John and the Epistle to the Ephesians, to be part of the Word of God. It bred a race of violent experimentalists, who were in their time enemies of Faith, of Charity, and of Order.”—Dr. Canon Liddon’s Sermon at St. Mary’s, Oxford, reported in the “Guardian” of June 25th, 1879.

“I know of no law, human or Divine, which forbids me, or any other freeborn Englishman, whilst submitting to every existing ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake, to use all constitutional means for the repeal and abrogation of all such laws as I believe to be mischievous and contrary to the revealed and declared Will of God. What I, for one, mean, when I say that I will do my utmost to undo the work of the Reformation, is this:—I believe that the chief and most important work which was done at the Reformation was to render the things of God unto Cæsar. I shall always strive, to the best of my humble ability, to give back to God the things of God. And the cuckoo-cry of ‘the principles of the Reformation are in danger,’ certainly will not scare me from my purpose. If the Reformation-gentlemen considered themselves justified, as I suppose they did, in upsetting the Settlement of Magna Charta, a Settlement brought about and cemented by the martyrdom of our most glorious Saint and Patron, St. Thomas, why should I have a moment’s hesitation in doing my best to strive to alter the Reformation Settlement and go back to that of Magna Charta and St. Thomas? I wait for an answer.”—“The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven”: a Sermon, by the Rev. T. W. Mossman, O.C.R., pp. 14, 15. London: 1879.

INTRODUCTION.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

WHEN, in 1833, the Tractarian movement first arose at Oxford, it is remarkable that its leaders, in their important work of restoration and reparation, commenced with explaining and maintaining the doctrine of the Sacraments, and not that of the true nature and character of the Universal Church. This was like carving the pinnacle before securing the foundation. They assumed, but never once attempted to prove, that the established Communion in England was identical, in all essential particulars, with the Old Church of the country, and in communion with the Church throughout the world. They started with the assumption that none of the changes at the "Reformation" had altered its organic life,

though the then disorganized religious state of England stared them in the face. Of course this easier method saved them a world of investigation and trouble. Having a solid foundation, as they so obviously believed themselves to possess, they could proceed to build up a superstructure. This, as we know, they did both with system and spirit. In so doing they took for granted that the ordinary historical theories concerning the changes under Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, were in the main true and to be depended on. But these theories have turned out to be only theories; and, though bolstered up for some years under Burnet's tuition; in the face of historical documents which have been brought to light of late, they now no longer hold their ground. They are exploded; for they were founded only on fiction and romance. It is hard to entertain the conviction that, during Queen Elizabeth's reign, the persecutors of the Catholics, men like Grindal, Sandys, Cecil, and Walsingham, belonged to the same religious communion as did those poor souls who, on religious grounds, endured such virulent persecution at their hands—the Rack, the Scavenger's Daughter, and the Little Ease. The idea of “the

Catholic Church," as set forth in the Three Creeds, was wholly different, therefore, in the minds of the persecutors and the persecuted. With the former "the Church" was a local or national institution recently made by themselves and Parliament, of which the Queen was the source of all jurisdiction and authority, the lawful bestower of the chief dignities, the final arbiter of all theological and ecclesiastical disputes; in fact, the Supreme Head or Governess. With the latter, as with St. Gregory the Great, it was "evident to all who knew the Gospel, that by the Voice of the Lord the care of the Whole Church was committed to Holy Peter, the Prince of all the Apostles. . . . For to him it is said, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church, and I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.' Behold he receives the Keys of the Heavenly Kingdom; the power of binding and of loosing is given to him. *To him the care and government of the whole Church is committed.*"*

* "Cunctis evangelium scientibus liquet, quod voce Dominica sancto et omnium Apostolorum principi Petro Apostolo totius Ecclesiæ cura commissa est. . . . Ecce claves Regni Cœlestis accipit, potestas ei ligandi ac solvendi tri-

The Tractarian movement, nevertheless, has done much for England ; for it has given a new phase of character to, and created a fresh interest in, the Established Church. In external questions—decency, order, and ornaments—it has brought about a silent revolution. The slovenly and idle of a previous generation, who moved in a well-defined groove, have given place to quite another race, much more active no doubt, owning several meritorious virtues ; but distinguished at the same time by greater narrowness, less solid learning and zeal, and a remarkable tendency on the part of some of its members to rest satisfied with ephemeral and shallow literature. Art, poetry, and architecture, however, discreetly made use of, have at the same time each lent a helping hand in securing the far better Reformation than that which was completed under Queen Elizabeth. Even in deeper and more important questions much has been likewise done by the Tractarians. So that if the main bulk of the nation, the people generally, have only been slightly touched by that

buitur, cura ei totius Ecclesiæ et principatus committitur.”—
“ S. Gregor. Mag. Epist. ad Maurit. August.,” lib. iv. Epist. 32.

movement; if the Establishment itself has become more comprehensive, a considerable and respectable minority—perhaps a third of the clergy, their dependents, and their immediate friends and allies; certain laymen with ecclesiastical tastes, and many single-women of the upper and middle classes—have been largely influenced.* Thus, as everyone may see, a minority has, both in principle and taste, become more Catholic; while the Church of England itself, in its corporate capacity, has distinctly grown more latitudinarian and human.

Out of this movement another has recently developed, harmless enough and even beneficial so long as the energies of its more active members were confined to restoring churches, introducing Gregorian music, and surpliced choirs, putting up

* In this movement it is remarkable,—as showing its exceptional characteristics,—that individual effort and not corporate action secures success. The Church of England itself, as a corporation, does little or nothing. Even if the ordinary work of Christianity has to be done, a special organization, like the S. P. G., the Tee-total Society, or the Home Mission Order, has to be started to do it. Moreover, so much depends on the lives of individuals. A certain work may flourish so long as some gifted parson carries it on; but, if change or death should happen, the work too often altogether collapses.

stained glass windows, wearing albs and chasubles, and repairing the universal ruin and desolation which the Reformation, the Great Rebellion, and the Revolution of William of Orange,—separate acts in one doleful drama,—have in turn so efficiently wrought. But anything but harmless, when it inconsistently began to advocate laxity of doctrine, and tolerate “Schools of Thought” in which Catholicism finds no place; to enlarge the breach between England and Rome; to discountenance Corporate Reunion; to disparage the English Roman Catholics,* who through so long a night of moral darkness have kept the Lamp of Divine Truth burning. These, though persecuted with demoniacal fury, have come forth again to proclaim, without change or variation, the very same Faith which Bede and St. Wilfred, St.

* Mr. Mackonochie, the noted Ritualist, is reported to have declared in a sermon that “separation from the Church of England involved separation from Christ.” If to the modern English Establishment had been exclusively entrusted the office of custodian of the Faith, it is no exaggeration to say that the Faith in England must long ago have perished; for even now it is impossible for anyone to declare for certainty what the Establishment teaches concerning the elementary doctrine of baptism; much less, in regard to others, what it preserves, affirms, or regards with indifference.

Thomas-the-Martyr, Warbam, More, Watson, and Cardinal Pole held and taught. They have an admirable organization; they cannot be ignored, and on every reasonable Anglican theory, being brethren in Christ, surely should not be abused.

It is of course disappointing and melancholy to note that some of the more recent exhibitions of "Ritualism," as it is called, display all the narrowness, virulence, and pettiness of the most perverse sects.* From fair and open argument with Roman Catholics their self-elected leaders have long ago retired; and by a now prolonged silence (except the hebdomadal jabber † of their

* As two recent examples of this, the cases of Mr. E. S. Grindle, the celebrated "Presbyter Anglicanus," and Mr. Orby Shipley, who disconnected themselves from the Establishment, will be familiar to all. The ungenerous, spiteful, and insolent manner in which some of their old allies at once wrote of them was pitiful and humiliating to read.

† As a specimen of the profane scoffing and infidel-like sneers (worthy of Voltaire himself) in which some of the Ritualists indulge, the following extract from one of the serials dated April 19th, 1879, edited by a parson, is given. It displays a vicious spirit so thoroughly repulsive and anti-Christian, that no wonder can arise that God seems to have forsaken the sect it represents, now given up to frivolity, intestine squabbles, and despair:—

"The Romans, I see, have imported miracles into England. France has no longer a monopoly of our Lady of Lourdes. She has condescended to cure the paralytic even in the very

cheap serials), appear to indicate that, confuted if not discomfited, they have given up the contest as lost. Their influence, consequently, is very much less than they assume it to be. It may be, and possibly is, very considerable in certain private convents, where the Superior, without legitimate authority or reasonable check of visitor or diocesan, can exercise a moral tyranny which only old women could practice, and only young ones put up with.

midst of 'unorthodox London.' The event came off a fortnight ago at a home for poor Roman Catholic boys in the Harrow Road, and which is supported by sensational advertisements headed 'Save the boy.' Lord Archibald Douglas is about to build a chapel for his lads, dedicated, of course, to our Lady of Lourdes, and, of course again, some of the water from the holy fountain was brought to England to be sprinkled round the foundation-stones. Two of the lads, who have been unable for many months to walk, through paralysis, were carried to see the ceremony, and sprinkled with the precious water. The story goes that on the morrow the nurse went to carry the boys as usual, but, *mirabile dictu*, they with one consent began to walk. The doctor will, of course, be ready to disclaim all merit in the earthly drugs which he was giving to them, and the people who set down the awe to excitement and overwrought expectation will be regarded as little better than infidels. And as a miracle is born, if I may so say, at one's very door, what the miracle will be like when it is full-grown, after all the witnesses have been scattered and investigation is rendered difficult, those may guess who have traced the effect of their own imagination in dealing with the wonderful." See "Appendix, No. III."

The reiterated boast, again, that the horny-handed Working-men of London and our great cities care for the Ritualistic movement, is at once confident and loud; but this appears to be only based on the daring assertions of unscrupulous wire-pullers; who, holding the strings and rings, lie concealed in the background, while their hired puppets caper and threaten, brag and posturize, reading out what has been written for them to maintain or assert on some public stage. Disorder and Topsy-turvyism must certainly have risen to a perfect climax, and all Authority have been repudiated, when composers, basket-makers, and the owners of cheap newspapers can unblushingly stand forward, without any commission whatsoever from their fellow-workmen, to browbeat, bully, and pretend to instruct the various bishops of the Established Church in their official duties.

But amongst the great mass of Englishmen the general policy of these Ritualists (besides being taken up so much with questions of externals,) is altogether too wayward and weak ever to command any but an occasional, and then very often only a contemptuous, consideration.

The old High Church party, or what now re-

mains of it, has still, as is well known, a few great and influential leaders with a small following in the nation, and smaller influence. Unable to resist the Divorce Bill,* the infidel School Board system, and Lord Penzance, its members still make weighty speeches and put forth disregarded Protests. For promoting Union and Defending the principles of the Church of England (whatever they may be), they form grand organizations like the English Church Union, which, it is to be feared, only make old separations more patent and fresh divisions more painful. Rome, and all that belongs thereto, they appear fanatically to hate—the language of some being at once ridiculous and profane; while they somewhat ostentatiously profess to be in love with what they call “the *true* principles of the Reformation.” Secret societies for special prayer, and for enabling ministerial neophytes to lead a less

* “The Divorce Act, so far as it went, *was an act of national apostasy*, and in a marvellously brief space, it has succeeded in breaking down the Christian instincts of the community. It gives us a startling view of the degradation of the public morals which has already taken place, to learn from Sir James Hannen that the motive of the suitors who go before him, is, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, simply to obtain a licence to marry again.”—“Church Times,” September 19th, 1879.

worldly life than many Church-of-England parsons live, like the Society of the Holy Cross, are blown down and fall to pieces like a child's card-house, when the breath of Public Opinion, bearing their condemnation, meets them all of a sudden. Scared members, forgetting their official dignity, scream at being discovered; and, in fear and trembling which seems perfectly sincere, are soon scattered as sheep without either fold or shepherd.

Archdeacon Palmer of Oxford, in his recent Charge (A.D. 1879), has described the position of the Established Church, and stated the case concerning the Supreme Jurisdiction of the Crown, with great accuracy and singular calmness. Temperate, unambiguous, and plain, he is at the same time frankly and perfectly Erastian; though apparently ready to sacrifice something, if it can be shown to him that the principle of Erastianism is fatal, as it certainly is, to any efficient Christian work. Moreover, he quite admits the right and reasonableness of endeavouring to remedy the evil in a constitutional method. Here are his words:—

“In my judgment, the cardinal fact is, that the final determination of all ecclesiastical causes is vested in the Crown,

and is confided to a Court which the Crown has established with the consent of Parliament, and of Parliament alone, and that all other courts ecclesiastical are bound to echo its decisions. This, as I have reminded you, has been the law and use of England for nearly three centuries and a half, if we neglect the short reign of Philip and Mary. It has been, in principle, more than once formally recognized, never formally repudiated, by the synods of the Church of England.*

“It is our right, as Englishmen, to use all lawful and constitutional means, in order to procure the repeal of the statutes on which this special jurisdiction of the Crown rests, if we think such repeal desirable—as it is our right to use like means in order to procure the repeal of any other statutes now in force. But it is also, I venture to think, our duty, both as Englishmen and as Churchmen, to obey these statutes while they are unrepealed, and to submit to the decisions of the court which derives its authority from them. I need not attempt to prove our duty as Englishmen to obey any law of the land; but I may be asked what further obligation to obedience in this particular lies on us as Churchmen. My answer is twofold. First, we are bound to obey,

* This statement of fact and law is mainly identical with that of the Archdeacon's brother, Lord Selborne, who in his controversies both with “A Sussex Priest,” Mr. E. S. Grindle, as to *principle*, and with Mr. James Parker of Oxford as to *fact*, retired in both cases from any attempt to maintain the two untenable positions which his lordship had assumed, and on which, it is to be feared, a Privy Council Judgment was in part founded. See “Canon or Statute: a Correspondence on the P. W. R. Act between Lord Selborne and a Sussex Priest.” London: 1875. “Did Queen Elizabeth take Other Order in the Advertisements of 1566? a Letter to Lord Selborne, with a Postscript. By James Parker, M.A.” London: 1879.

on the principle of deference to Church authority. Our Church, as I have said already, has more than once synodically affirmed the Supreme Jurisdiction of the Crown in causes ecclesiastical; she has never synodically rejected it. Secondly, we are bound to obey, on the principle of regard to the highest interests of the Church. I do not speak of lands, or money, or any civil privileges whatever. I value these things highly. I value highly what men call the establishment of religion in this country. But I value it only as means to an end; I value it only as a gigantic home Mission fund, which enables the Church to carry the message of salvation to the poorest districts of our great towns, and the most secluded nooks in England. Let it all go to-morrow, if it can be shown to be the price of its retention that the Church must deny her Lord, or cease to do His work effectively."

As showing the actual working of this system before our eyes, the following advice by Bishop Moberly, in his recent Charge to the clergy of his diocese (A.D. 1879) regarding the use of the Mixed Chalice and the duty of obedience to Lord Penzance, appears astounding:—

His lordship "was ready to admit, in the abstract, that a secular authority ought not to interpose in matters of sacred doctrine; but still he thought the wisest course would be to submit to decisions when they had once been pronounced (even when they pressed unduly upon the clergy), instead of permitting them to be pointed at as signs of disunion. The Bishop referred to the 'Mixed Chalice' question, and quoted various authorities to show that the Mixed Chalice, probably made use of by our Lord Himself at the institution of the Eucharist, was certainly in use in the Primitive Church, and

that there was nothing to show that it ever gave rise to superstition in the Roman Church before the Reformation. He considered it had never been prohibited by Act of Parliament or Canon, but he counselled the clergy, as an adverse judgment had been given, to refrain from the practice in question."

On which it is sufficient to remark that if, in the first ages of the Church, the bishops had shown themselves to have been as amiable, peace-loving, and impressible as Dr. Moberly, there would certainly have been no Christianity of any sort or kind left to be squabbled over in the present faithless age. It must surely be rather a stretch of faith—not to write "an act of credulity"—to believe that men like this are divinely-appointed custodians of the Christian deposit of Faith.

The Key to the spiritual position, as both Arch-deacon and Bishop conclusively show, and as all can now see, was long ago given up, when England was duped into practically repudiating her relations with the Universal Christian Kingdom, its laws, and its ruler. Cranmer first betrayed the local flock which he was to govern; and so made a similar work easier for those who came after him,—Matthew Parker and his immediate allies. The New Church, as finally arranged,

formed, and moulded under Queen Elizabeth, was a purely local and national body, neither more nor less ; and has so remained under a variety of theological and ecclesiastical changes,* unto the present day. For no national Parliament can possibly create a divine institution, and the missionary work of a human society ever fails. Parliament may properly give a charter to a gas company, or authorize a railway board to use a corporate seal ; but as for making a "Church" which is not inherently and essentially national and local—this is altogether beyond its great and acknowledged powers.

The sooner, therefore, that members of the Established Communion admit this and begin to

* Mr. F. H. Dickenson, a frequent correspondent of the "Guardian," in a Letter which appeared in the number for September 10th, 1879, writes most truly and accurately thus:—"Any one who has watched the Church of England during the past forty years must see that *Our Faith and Doctrine have largely altered ; and there is no reason to think that alteration has ceased,*"—one fresh proof, were it needed, of the changeable and human character of the institution in question. Did the "Guardian's" correspondent regard it as divine, he would no doubt instinctively shrink from making proposals to patch, mend, or further "reform" it. As it stands, he merely exercises, with regard to it, the inherent and indisputable right of every free-born Englishman.

realize the most primary and elementary detail of God's revelation—and so, by precise thought, recognize respectively the true nature of the Church of Pentecost and the actual character of the Church of England; regarding each of which many have the most confused and inexact ideas)—the better will it be for all of us. By a series of tortuous arguments and historical misrepresentations, confusion has been made worse confounded. For loose expressions, words like “the Church” used in half a dozen different senses, and a mis-bestowal of the marks of the One Catholic body—the Ark of Salvation,—upon mere local communions, cannot be sufficiently reprehended.* Such dialectical ambiguities perplex,

* I take the following from the current newspapers and serials of September, 1879: “*Our Mother, the Church of England.*”—“*Our Church* is far more favoured of God than any other Church.”—“Not true members of *Our Church* at all; their hearts are elsewhere, with another Church,” &c.—“*Our beloved Church* is founded on the Bible, whereas,” &c.—“Where other Churches have secured a vantage-ground *Our Church* should certainly do the same.”—“They remain in *Our Church* in order to revile her,” &c. &c. &c. *ad nauseam*: all most conclusively proving that in the minds of the loose-thinking scribblers who use such phrases “*Our Church*” is (as without a doubt it most certainly is) something quite different from the Church of the Creeds—the One Divine and Worldwide Corporation.

confuse and mislead. The One Church of God is alone divine, all local and national churches being essentially human.

As a consequence of such unfortunate confusion of thought and expression, certain persons have acted in late years as though the actual laws of the national Church of England ought to be practically revised or modified from time to time by some other external and independent law—some fanciful ideal, some statute of Utopia;—and in so acting have brought much trouble upon themselves and little advantage to their neighbours. How can the Catholic Church—which concerns all nations and peoples, but belongs exclusively to none—which is infallible, for it was created by the Holy Spirit,—how can this Divine Corporation either revise or reverse the sentences of any Parliamentary communion? What actual machinery can be brought into operation to effect such a process? Which of the ancient canons, moreover, ever recognized a woman as capable of being Supreme Head of a parish—putting aside a diocese or a group of dioceses? The Catholic Church throughout the whole world is, as we all know, guided by canon law, administered by living and lawful ecclesiastical judges, independent of Kings,

Queens, and all secular rulers, and not amenable to civil courts; while the Church of England is now notoriously governed by Lord Penzance. Thomas Cromwell first ruled it under Henry VIII., Somerset under Edward VI., Cecil under Elizabeth. Ever since its foundation it has been similarly governed, either by Commissioners appointed by the monarch, or some local court; and as long as it retains its present position, isolated and local, it will continue to be so governed.

People complain of the English Court of Appeal in spiritual causes,* which consists of certain

* "What, I ask," wrote Mr. ex-Chancellor Wagner, "would St. Ambrose have said to the recent trial of 'Jenkins *versus* Cooke'?" This unseemly trial proves, beyond all possibility of cavil, that the Civil Power in England *claims* to decide, in the last resort, not merely '*the temporal accidents of spiritual things,*' but even who shall, or who shall not, be admitted to the Holy Communion, and, *what is infinitely more serious still, that the Primate of all England is quite willing personally to acquiesce in this most fatal claim,* else he would have refused, with horror, to sit in the Court at all. It is sadly significant and noteworthy that not one single bishop of the province of Canterbury has, as yet, *publicly* protested against a claim which, if granted, would wholly efface the spiritual authority of a 'bishop in the Church of God,' and make him the mere creature or tool of the Civil Power, powerless to exert the authority entrusted to him by our Lord Jesus Christ."—"Christ or Cæsar?" Part II. p. 40. London: 1877.

Privy Councillors; but if they are content to remain visibly separated from the rest of Christendom, and not amenable to the great and universal Court of Appeal of the One Catholic Church,—and to this they are certainly *not* amenable, for some positively glory in their isolation,—they must put up with the inconvenience and make the best of it.

The law which this local and peculiar Court professes to administer is not the law of God; of that it knows nothing, and cares nothing. Its business is to regulate the public preaching and teaching of the ministers of the Establishment, not according to God's revelation or the canon law of the Church Universal—with these it has nothing whatsoever to do—but, as the Reformers first determined, in strict and literal accordance with the Statutes of the Realm, with the enactments of the British Parliament.

As regards religion, every doctrine of God's revelation is subjected to the decisions of purely State tribunals. Our Blessed Lord is now only permitted to occupy that place which a representation of Him obtained under Alexander Severus, in the Temple of the Gods. All religions, it is maintained, are at last alike. The Church is now

a "denomination." The crimes of blasphemy, infidelity, sacrilege, and atheism, moreover, are at length no crimes at all. Civil and religious liberty has efficiently changed all that. Images of atheists are set up in the public thoroughfares, and pointed at with pride as representations of great public benefactors. Blasphemers are honoured, and people are thus indirectly enjoined to go and do likewise. Parental rights, moreover, having their roots in natural religion, are, as regards education in England, on the high road to being altogether wiped out and lost. Of this the mob approves. The source of all Authority, whether that of kings or priests, is God Almighty; but, when legitimate Authority is laughed to scorn and trampled under foot by those who in its place have set up a rival human authority—always wayward, weak, uncertain, vacillating, and liable to all kinds of error—those who refuse to believe, fear, and serve their Maker, find that they too soon become slaves, tyrannized over cruelly, and whose backs are in the long run well scourged by scorpions of their own nurturing.

People sometimes remark that our Catholic ancestors must have been very indifferent or

greatly wanting in zeal to have allowed such changes as those effected by a few "Reformers" to have been made without resistance. But in answer to this it should be remembered that they *did* resist to the best of their ability. In Yorkshire, Durham, Norfolk, Devonshire, Oxfordshire, and Lincolnshire, at various times, a most noble resistance *was* made by force, as well by poor as by rich. But it failed; and the heavy hand of Vengeance, with a sanguinary and cruel grip,* came down upon all engaged in that resistance.

But to judge this question more equitably. Let us consider how tamely and quietly the changes effected by the Divorce Court, Infidel Education, and Lord Penzance's Parliamentary

* The Catholic Relief Act of 1778, and for Ireland in 1782, which relaxed some of the more ferocious parts of the penal laws and their most cruel grip, was only passed at a time when France and America were in confederation against England, and union at home was sorely needed. Down to that period the penal statutes of Elizabeth, James I., and William of Orange had disgraced our statute book. In addition to persecution, riots, and violence for Roman Catholics were known under Lord George Gordon; again in 1807, in 1829, and in 1846; and again when the new Roman Catholic Hierarchy was set up. It is highly improbable that this volcano is quite extinct; for, as most of the legal relaxations of late years have been made at times of national trial and political strain, when fears abounded, the real sentiments of the populace may be unknown or inadequately forecast.

authority—certain steps in our downward descent as a nation—are being actually submitted to, before our very eyes, ere we judge our ancestors too severely. The disastrous divisions of the Reformation have finally resulted in the anti-Christian system of education now completely in the ascendant. At the universities, in our ancient grammar-schools, as well as in the recent national plan for instructing the lower classes—supported by public rates*—the Christian Religion is quietly and contemptuously set aside,—with evil results which will soon enough be painfully discovered. Such a system of public schools

* Dr. James Fraser, who occupies the position of a Christian bishop at Manchester, is reported to have quite recently remarked that he looked upon the gradual extinction of all schools save Board Schools with calm satisfaction and without any fear. The Vicar-General of the Diocese of Salford, however, recently pointed out that “the Church of England was gradually surrendering the great principles of religious education and handing her schools over to the School Boards. After a while the Church-of-England schools would cease altogether to be public elementary schools. When that time came there would remain only the Board schools and the Catholic schools. How long it would be before this change would take place he could not say, but the course followed by the clergy of the National Church left little doubt that a change would one day take place. As for Catholics, they could never surrender their schools to the School Boards or any other authority. With the Godless education of the Board schools they could never have anything to do.”

may probably soon result in a corresponding system of public churches, where every sect may perform its orgies; and where, moreover, every individual may worship whatsoever god or gods may have been set up, or may be tolerated, by the State; or where the more advanced "philosophers" may worship each other or themselves. Now, it is only a very small minority of the English people who can heartily approve of either of these three dangerous measures, yet they have been each duly carried, and are now the law of the land; while few, possibly, would dream of agitating for their abolition. The evil is seen, but not the remedy. Patriotism, zeal, and self-sacrifice are all given up in favour of self-seeking, wicked principles, and a false peace—that peace which only too surely heralds national corruption and certain decay.

In our cities and large towns—which are quietly reverting to Paganism; for, of late years, since the infamous "Gorham Judgment," not more than fifteen per cent. of the people are baptized at all*—what do we behold? The

* At the Swansea Congress, the Rev. G. A. Seymour, of Winchester, maintained that "there is amongst our people a lamentable neglect of the Sacrament of Baptism, and stated

churches of the Establishment too often ill-attended, and in some parts practically empty.

that hardly more than ten per cent. of our people in our large towns are baptized in the Church of England. He considered that amongst Christian nations England was in this particular the lowest in the scale, except perhaps America."—"Guardian," October 8, 1879. In the same number, but on another page, of the newspaper from which the above is taken, there appeared a letter signed "A Country Clergyman," which ran thus. The words in italics and within brackets are my own comments:—"Sir,—An unbaptized child died in my parish the other day. Immediately I heard of it I went to the house and offered to show my respect [*for its parents who had studiously despised our Lord's command*] and sympathy [*for them under the stupid charges which believers in the Christian Religion might make*] by officiating at the funeral [*contrary to the rules of the Prayer Book and the law of the land*]. I explained that I would put on my surplice and say the Lord's Prayer at the grave. My offer was most gratefully accepted. I used the following short service, compiled from Bishop How's "Pastor in parochiâ," and from our own services [*and so proved to the parents and the public that baptism is a mere ceremony, and that the unbaptized have quite as much right to Christian burial by the parson as the baptized. Am I not liberal with the trust which has been reposed in me?*] I gave the relatives a copy of the prayer, with which they were much pleased."—In the "Reunion Magazine," vol. i. pp. 51-73, is an article on "Baptism in the Church of England," from the pen of a layman, (as is said,) in which some carefully-arranged statistics show that in some parishes just four per cent. of the children born, and no more, are baptized; in others on an average about nine per cent. On pp. 494-498, are letters which show that Bishop Alford, who has "warned people to be on their guard against the fashionable doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration," openly baptized fourteen adults by once flicking his wetted fingers in the air over all of them, and that in a large Oxfordshire

Violent changes, from services of a Catholic character to those of a Puritan, and *vice versâ*, have often led to indifference. Zeal in a Catholic direction, having been consistently frowned upon by State authorities, has too often been clean stamped out. The churches on Sundays are thus empty and the streets crowded. What there may we see? A poor, down-looking, stunted race, with hard features and anxious, care-worn faces; out of the effeminate mouths of nine out of every ten stumpy men a burnt and smoking pipe sticking out like a spout or drain—the smouldering narcotic of which is supposed, in some manner, to stimulate their enfeebled and flagging energies. These pitiable forms seem, all of them, at once so self-engrossed and restless, eagerly hurrying on to growl over or gnaw the World's meat which perisheth, that no ray, even the faintest, of the beautiful life to come ever seems to fall upon their thronged and darkened pathway. For Faith is dead. They believe only in that which they can handle and clutch. Of the Angel-world

town the font has never been filled for forty years. Cardinal Newman and Mr. Robert Brett long ago pointed out the neglect of baptism, as also did the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, of Frome.

and the Supernatural, of times when the veil around this earth is drawn aside, and glimpses of Another World are in mercy momentarily bestowed, they neither know nor care. Their gods and guides are the men of science, falsely so called, or—to rise to a somewhat higher level—it may be their own bellies. Their dismal gospel is summed up in the popular but dread resolution—“Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.” Therefore they all make our nation now stand out as a striking contrast to “Merry England of the olden time.”

As to many rural districts, the spirit of Indifference, like a dark cloud, has settled on the once happy homes of our country poor. The State Religion, on which the Reformation-impress is still indelibly stamped,* influences them but

* “I have known the Communion-table used as a writing desk for Sunday-school children, and at Vestry-meetings.”—Rev. W. H. Kelke, “Records of Bucks,” vol. iii. p. 127.—In a small but curious volume, “Odds and Ends” (London: 1872), Mr. William Maskell gives an account of an unique atrocity—the dissection, in the year 1839, of a corpse that had been exhumed, upon the Communion-table of the church of Powerstock in Dorsetshire. “The Church,” he writes, “was shut up for three weeks after, on account of the stench which had penetrated through and saturated the entire building. I believe,” he continues, “that the Communion-table was then restored to its former sacred purpose.”—pp. 54-73.

feebly, if at all. In Lincolnshire, Norfolk, Buckinghamshire, and South Wales, many of the village churches, week by week, are practically empty. In towns Dissent still breeds; while Unbelief, chilling its thousands to the heart's core, leaves them desolate and sad; restless in the present, hopeless for the future, or quietly indifferent. For, beginning with the elementary doctrine of baptism, every detail of sacred revelation has long been a topic of controversy, wrangled over by the misbelieving and profane. Faith has at length so melted into opinion or mere sentiment, that even the Home of Opinion, now swept and garnished, is found to be cold, empty, and desolate. There is neither voice nor language, nor any to answer, nor any to regard. Some few by custom still superstitiously expose their phylactery and quote their favourite texts, —like the ancient dame, who, as she asserted, found such personal comfort from mumbling over and over again the consoling word “Mesopotamia”; but a supernatural law (as it is assumed to be) without a lawful interpreter, as a religion without a divine guide, or a so-called “spiritual body” without a spiritual head, can only first lose the confidence, and then deservedly

merit the contempt, of those who for generations can trace the dire influence of "Reform," and long for a divine peace, forfeited and lost in past centuries; gone perhaps, for those few who most keenly miss it, never to return.

The only persons who have duly surveyed and accurately measured the situation as to profit by it, are the modern Latitudinarians or Liberals—the legitimate successors of Socinus, Cranmer, Erastus, Tillotson, Hoadley, and Balguy. And, since the rise of the Oxford movement, the leaders of it, in their conflicts with Latitudinarians, have, by reason of their losses and disasters, been again and again compelled to shift their position, modify their principles,* and change their tactics. Persons professing the Catholic Faith, out of communion with the rest of Christendom, inevitably maintain their difficult position under the greatest

* *E.g.* the late Rev. John Keble in the poem on "Gunpowder Treason," having relinquished the inexact belief of the Reformers for the teaching of the Catholic Church, somewhat awkwardly altered his verse. See p. 40, where the original poem is quoted.—Still more recently, Archdeacon Denison, who took so prominent a part in the restoration of Convocation, deplored his mistake in having done so; believing, because of later events, that Convocation had done more harm than good. The truth is that, until the question of the relations of England to the rest of Christendom is faced and settled, little can or will be done.

disadvantages. No one could have fought the battle of Catholic dogma in the Church of England, with greater foresight, discretion, and ability than did Dr. Newman when at Oxford. But, with all his consummate tact and immense learning, with all his high generosity and notorious zeal, he frankly and truly confessed himself defeated.* The Liberals or Latitudinarians won

* "The most oppressive thought in the whole process of my change of opinion, was the clear anticipation, verified by the event, that it would issue in the triumph of Liberalism. Against the anti-dogmatic principle I had thrown my whole mind; yet now I was doing more than anyone else could do to promote it. I was one of those who had kept it at bay in Oxford for so many years; and thus my very retirement was its triumph. *The men who had driven me from Oxford were distinctly the Liberals; it was they who had opened the attack upon Tract 90, and it was they who would gain a second benefit, if I went on to retire from the Anglican Church.* But this was not all. As I have already said, there are but two alternatives, the way to Rome, and the way to Atheism; Anglicanism is the halfway-house on the other. How many men were there, as I knew full well, who would not follow me now in my advance from Anglicanism to Rome, but would at once leave Anglicanism and me for the Liberal camp. It is not at all easy (humanly speaking) to wind up an Englishman to a dogmatic level. I had done so in a good measure in the case both of young men and of laymen, the Anglican *Via Media* being the representative of dogma. The dogmatic and the Anglican principle were one, as I had taught them; but I was breaking the *Via Media* to pieces, and would not dogmatic faith altogether be broken up, in the minds of a great number, by the demolition of the *Via Media*? Oh!

in almost every conflict. With what result is well known. Dr. Newman and his friends were driven out; while Dr. Tait, one of the Four Tutors who persecuted him, is at Canterbury, and is still bent on getting rid of the Athanasian Creed, in which he frankly avows neither he himself nor his brother-prelates believe,* it being too dogmatic in itself, and too distasteful to the Public. Dr. Hampden died Bishop of Hereford. The Editor of "Essays and Reviews" is now Bishop of Exeter, welcomed by High Churchmen for his zeal and energy. The present Bishop of Salisbury, who so disliked Dr. Newman's "Essay on Development" that he formally replied to it, has himself so developed in the Latitudinarian direction that he actually administered the Lord's Supper at Westminster to a Unitarian preacher. Thus the Liberals—aided, of course, by their own political party, and bribed and promoted by the

how unhappy this made me!"—"History of my Religious Opinions," by J. H. Newman, D.D. (original edition), pp. 329-330. London: 1864.

* "We [the Archbishop and Bishops] do not,—there is not a soul in this room who does,—take the concluding clauses of the Athanasian Creed in their plain and literal sense."—Speech of Archbishop Tait in Convocation, "Guardian," February 14th, 1872.

Conservatives—triumph all along the line. And so-called “High Churchmen” have at length condescended to be their faithful armour-bearers and trumpeters.

The spring of these Liberals or Erastians is elastic, and their grasp firm, as when, rising to shake themselves from the temporary dust of any conflict with High Churchmen, they sufficiently realize their own strength, and, with disdain for their discomfited opponents and with considerable self-confidence, march forward to greater victories. They know too well that the power of the English Establishment either to maintain or to enforce the dogmatic principle is as the power of a lifeless and rain-sodden scarecrow, neither more nor less. They perceive most accurately that the authority which first created the Establishment, and as is reasonable enough, still effectually dominates it, intends to dominate it. This every bishop sees and knows.* That power was Parliament; it is now

* Quite recently the Bishop of Oxford, somewhat misconceiving his position, went in person as a suppliant to the Court of Queen's Bench, asking that he might be allowed to act as a true bishop in his own diocese. But the Court, which of course represents Her Majesty the Queen,—the Supreme Governess of the Church of England, from whom (as Dr. Mackarness on his knees before her duly acknowledged)

Parliament, modified, reformed, and extended,—ever influenced in the present enlightened age by Public Opinion; but, at best, Parliament.

However, the very boldness of these triumphant Erastians in high places, their sharply-defined and sweeping policy, carried out with no regard to the convictions of their opponents, and with an inconsiderate roughness and rudeness worthy of Thomas Cromwell or Hugh Latimer, has done more than anything else to throw many Christian people back on first principles. So long as some moderation and impartiality were shown at Lambeth; so long as it was possible to believe by a kind of traditional fiction that the so-called “Church Courts” *were* Church Courts, people, without inquiring, were content to regard them as such, and quietly to acquiesce. But the Public

he received both spiritualities as well as temporalities,—declined to allow him to do anything of the sort. Lord Penzance is now the Chief Ecclesiastical Judge for Her Majesty in every diocese; in Oxford as elsewhere. He was set up by a recent and special Act, which either all the bishops helped to pass, or now willingly administer; and therefore Bishop Mackarness’ demand was obviously unreasonable. The Act in question, though with art and cunning made specially for the inferior parsons, is thus found to have included the bishops. The Bishop of London has recently admitted, in his “Charge” [1879], that it was both a mistake and a failure.

Worship Regulation Act* has successfully destroyed all such notions; while the appointment by the two Primates of an ex-Judge of the Divorce Court to work the Act was a deliberate insult to the Christian clergy, and an outrage disgraceful to all concerned.† It has, at all events, shown

* "It is, in point of fact—at least, so it seems to me—a thoroughly revolutionary measure *in its principle*, having for its main end or consequence the abolition of all the ancient courts Christian; courts which, however fallen from their first estate, and unsatisfactory in their [present condition, have existed from the very earliest times in this country, and were an integral part of its Christianity; and the substitution in their stead of a new secular court, with no Christian instincts or traditions whatever to guide it, and deriving its authority and jurisdiction in no way whatever from the Church, but entirely from the new Act of Parliament which created it. Regarded in this light, which I believe to be the true light, and one, I fear, which the verdict of Posterity will only too fully endorse, the Public Worship Regulation Act of last year is one of the most mischievous and indefensible measures ever yet concocted. For it is the virtual triumph of the anti-Christian principle of Erastianism over ecclesiastical authority and independence; the acknowledgment, in practical effect, by the voice of the nation, that the Established Church of England is to be regarded from henceforth as little better than a mere State function or department of the earthly State, instead of (as it must be if it be Christ's representative) its spiritual ruler and teacher."—"Christ or Cæsar?" Part II. pp. 6, 7. London: 1877.

† "I do not suppose a more galling insult to a body of educated gentlemen, such as the clergy of England are, is recorded in history than that which has been practically offered to us by the two Archbishops (Tait and Thomson) in the peculiar character of the appointment they have

conclusively the true character of the Establishment and its rulers,—a singular advantage to those who, like the late Mr. Keble, have been long doubtful whether it was from Heaven or of men.* As long, of course, as people cannot perceive the evils which exist, so long no remedy can possibly be forthcoming.

In the sixteenth-century breach with Rome, the *first* point and position repudiated was that the Pope, either by divine right or of ecclesiastical necessity, had any reason, duty, or call to interfere with the concerns of the Church of England. The English Church was affirmed to be, of itself, a perfect and complete spiritual

thought fit to make.”—“Christ or Cæsar?” by A. D. Wagner, Chancellor of Chichester Cathedral, Part II. p. 10. London: 1877.

* “I suppose, from some part of your letter, that you have been told I am speaking to friends occasionally as if I was perplexed about continuing where I am. My perplexity is rather what to say to others who ask my advice, than how to act myself. Few persons have a stronger feeling than I of the duty of continuing where one’s lot is cast, except where the call to go elsewhere is very plain. It may be that I do not see my way clearly in the controversy between us and Rome; but as long as I was in doubt, and perhaps a good deal longer than I might seem to myself in speculation to be so, I should think it my duty to stay where I am.”—“Memoir of Rev. John Keble,” by Sir J. T. Coleridge, p. 230. London: 1869.

kingdom, wanting neither advice, assistance, nor interference from without. On this point the new Statute of Appeals* was very clear. Having thus deliberately removed the keystone to the perfect Arch of Truth and Unity, other stones, one after the other, some large, some small, were more easily taken out and thrown aside; with what eventual result to that divinely-built Arch everyone can now too plainly perceive. Many of these stones, (to carry on the simile,) long lost or lying neglected amongst surrounding rubbish, have been painfully discovered and carefully replaced. For this no Christian patriot can be too heartily grateful. Newman, Pusey, Manning, Keble, Marriott, and Robert Wilberforce, amongst others, did the work. But the last stone to be secured and put up again in

* The words of this innovating statute are:—"The body spiritual whereof having power, when any cause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, then it was declared, interpreted, and showed by that part of the body politic called the spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, which always hath been reputed and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, it hath been always thought, and is also at this hour sufficient and meet of itself without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain."

the order of time, though the chiefest in importance and most needed, (because without it the others are unbonded together, and the spiritual construction remains inherently imperfect,) is the key-stone of the completed Arch,—the Primacy of the Father of the Faithful,—of him who, in Christ's Name, guides both pastors and sheep, as Patriarch of the Church Universal. A visible ruler for a diocese, and a primate for a province, reasonably imply the need of one visible head for the whole Family. The day has not yet dawned for this crowning work of the Tractarian movement to be undertaken. But, though some for politic reasons, timorous or crotchety, may deny its importance, everything points silently to the certain issue indicated. In the *destructive* Reformation of the sixteenth century the Pope was *first* repudiated, then certain doctrines and practices; in the better and *constructive* movement of the present day, the lost doctrines have already been recovered; an acknowledgment of the traditional and reasonable rights of the See of St. Peter,* will naturally come *last*: at all

* The statement that "the bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England" (Art. xxvii.) has long ceased to be an accurate proposition. In the present day it

events with those Christians in the Establishment who, by co-operation and reunion, are prepared to resist Latitudinarianism, False Science, Erastianism, and blank Infidelity, so dangerous in these latter days, so potent, so diabolical.

The labour may be painful, the cost considerable, some may be even working against their will, the sacrifices may be great; but, for all these, the work will be surely and efficiently completed.*

is plainly contrary to obvious facts. Under altered circumstances, Parliament ought now to construct another Article, harmonizing with Parliamentary changes. Again: the 28th Article pronounces a certain doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Altar to be "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture." Now the plain words are these:—"This is my Body." Consequently when our Lord said, "This *is* My Body," the plain meaning of these words was "This is *not* My Body." By parity of reasoning, had our Lord said, "This is *not* My Body," the plain meaning of His words would have been—Transubstantiation. On the same principle, when there came a Voice from Heaven:—"This is My Beloved Son," it is "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture" to suppose that the Eternal Father revealed the Hypostatic Union: but if the Eternal Father had affirmed, "This is *not* My Beloved Son," the plain meaning would have been what in short every good Christian believes—erroneously as it would seem on such "Elizabethan" principles of interpretation—to be true.

* About a century and a half ago, this was prophesied as sure to come to pass. Our Blessed Saviour appeared in a vision to a humble Catholic, who was constantly asking at the throne of grace for the restoration of the Ancient

And it will be completed from within.* Beneficent and practical reformers from all sides, and of all sorts, mainly Liberals, are still at work upon its further "reform"; ever mending, tinkering, and changing it. There is surely room, therefore, within its wide-embracing fold and comprehensive boundaries, for those few who, having reached a somewhat higher and clearer altitude than that ordinarily attained by their fellows in the fog and mist below, can plainly see that all such destructive "Reforms" (judging by past experience) are likely to turn out as profitless and worthless as those of previous centuries; and who long for the religious oneness of old. The English people were promised national unity in religion, but this was never secured to them—poor dupes! even

Faith, and He said, "My son, I have heard your prayer so often poured out before Me; I will have mercy upon England." "When, Lord; oh! when?" "Not now," replied our Blessed Saviour, "but when England shall build as many churches as she destroyed at the change of Religion; and when she shall restore and beautify the remainder."—See, for this account at length, "The Future Unity of Christendom," by A. L. P. De Lisle, p. 68. London: 1857.

* The Church of England points out with great clearness how this may be done, by its very distinct directions concerning conditional baptism. What is applicable to the Sacrament of Regeneration is, of course, of equal applicability to Confirmation, Orders, &c.

though gibbet and butcher's knife, rack and torture, were enlisted in the enterprising work; and now, instead of the unity of bygone centuries, they are cursed with the active dissensions and noisy screams of a hundred and fifty discordant and repulsive sects.

Who will say, then, that it would be unwise and unreasonable for the National Church,—or at all events for those within its broad borders who still believe in the Christian revelation, to admit its failure, and by combination strive to cause its acknowledged isolation and impotence to come to an end?

There are very few members of the Church of England who do not now admit that, whatever its deserts, disestablishment, disendowment, and disruption are not unlikely to be its eventual fate. They only differ as to when these final "reforms," as they term them, are likely to take place. For since the Primate of Christendom has been robbed and disendowed at Rome—England having stood admiringly by—local institutions of a similar kind are not likely to survive for long. Why, then, should not such a disastrous issue for our beloved country be duly looked in the face and prepared for? Those who in the National Church still

believe in God the Trinity, in the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, and in that Divine Corporation (Baptism being the gate of entrance to it) the One Catholic Church, should on every ground visibly unite, not only amongst themselves, but with all other parts of God's One Family (by regeneration). The various recent movements for Corporate Reunion* prove that men's hearts are now, thank God! being, to some extent, turned away from strife and contention towards peace, co-operation, and unity.

Furthermore,—as a practical consideration,—in the Church of England,—the universal liberty which is granted to all cannot be denied only to those who hold the Catholic Faith† in its integrity; and who, witnessing the miserable divisions around and about, aim at removing them and healing the breaches. As citizens they have a perfect and unchallenged right, through their natural birth, to all the privileges of membership of the Established Church, just as baptized per-

* See Appendix, No. II.

† “Far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such-like Churches.”—Canon, No. xxx. of 1603.

sons (if baptized) they have an equal right to all the privileges of the Church Universal. These latter privileges, if refused or denied to them in the public edifices of the National Communion (in which the National Will is dominant), they not only have a similar right, but own a positive duty to secure for themselves in some other way. Furthermore, by argument and reasoning they are free to promote change, so as, without destruction or revolution, to seek out the old ways and return to the ancient paths.

To the few—they are sure to be “Liberals”—who may unfairly deny to others that liberty which they so constantly claim for themselves, and who may urge “patience,” love for our step-mother, and “loyalty”: to those likewise who may prate about disloyalty to the Church of England, the Author may reply in the forcible words of another:—

“What and where is the Church of England to which I am disloyal? So far as the Church of England is identified with Christian doctrine, Christian worship, Christian discipline, and upholds and maintains these, I am as loyal and as devoted to her now as I ever was, or as any one else can be. But what is meant by the Church of England in connection with the idea of loyalty to the Church of England? Is it the Church of England of the High Church party, or of the Low Church party, or of the Broad Church party? for

the members of these three parties seem to me to mean quite different things by the phrase 'Church of England.' Is it a book two hundred years old? or a tradition? or a sentiment? or the will of the nation? or a body corporate—a living organization? If it be a living organization, how does it make its voice heard? for a society in which there is 'no voice nor any that answereth' is not the Church of God. As an individual clergyman, I have long been asking myself 'What is my authority for what I teach and do?' To my mind the responsibility of teaching others in matters affecting their salvation—a responsibility at all times great and overwhelming—becomes absolutely insupportable when there is no living Authority to which the individual teacher can refer, and by which he can be guided and fortified." *

The Author of this volume does not profess that it is a History of the Reign of the successful but miserable woman who ruled the nation's destinies for nearly forty-five years, and regarding whom the common herd entertain such loose but glowing ideas. It is only intended to be a sketch of the state of the Church during that period. To write the History of the years between Elizabeth's accession and her death would involve the production of many large volumes. Here the author's aim has been to provide a plain and readable account of what actually occurred, as

* "Do They Well to be Angry? By Presbyterian Anglicanus," p. 26. London: 1876.

far as it practically bears on the new ecclesiastical position, upon which recent events have thrown so clear and powerful a light; and, in so doing, neither to keep in the background unpleasant and unwelcome facts—a policy successfully adopted by so many Church-of-England writers—nor so to lay on heavily the dull colours of a somewhat dark picture, as, by finishing-touches, to make it at all darker than it need be. For this there is no necessity whatsoever. The naked acts of certain of those who had secured the upper hand, plainly and faithfully recorded, either from their own words or from authentic documents, are decidedly not pleasant reading for simple-minded folks who reverently believe that what some persons term “the Reformation” was another sacred Pentecost, and had for its Divine Author (may God pardon their delusion!) the Holy Spirit of Truth.

As this book is passing through the press, a friend, who has efficiently aided me, calls my attention to a statement of fact extracted from one of the Ritualistic newspapers, concerning the so-called “Reformers,” which is here appended:—

“They began by making the Holy Eucharist contemptible in the eyes of the nation, and went on to make it unusual as

well as slovenly. The complaint of the people under Edward VI. that the altars had been in many places turned into "oyster-boards" was not, as has been falsely alleged, a coarsely ribald perversion of facts. It was the literal truth. Wherever the more Zwinglian bishops and clergy had their way, it was no such structure as that which we see to-day in every fairly decent English church, in shape, size, position and covering—in short, every way except being of wood instead of stone—like the old altars, which served for the celebration of the Sacrament. Common trestles and boards (just like those on which even still street vendors of shell-fish exhibit their wares) carried in and out of church with exactly the same care and quietness as they are now used for a schoolroom tea, were what the astonished people saw; and the Sacrament dispensed with as much studious irreverence as if the minister had intended nothing save to make it contemptible. Then, besides, whereas up to 1549 there was not a corner of England where there was not at least a weekly Mass accessible, and very few where there was not a daily one within easy reach, the first result of the Zwinglian action in 1552 was to sweep away the daily Mass* everywhere, and the Sunday Mass, as it would seem, in a number of places, at once considerable, and rapidly becoming the great majority. And in the third place, whereas the Mass had been from the earliest days of Christendom the chief, and for more than a thousand years the most public, rite of the Church, it was not now merely made infrequent, but was hustled, as it were, into a corner, just as if a thing to be

* The person who could deliberately write of the Elizabethan Reformers' Supper as a "Mass" must be either a profound ignoramus or as daring as he is impudent and dishonest. For the celebration of Mass was distinctly

ashamed of; and the evil custom sprang up, albeit not justified then or since by any rubric or canon, of restricting all knowledge of it to the small and steadily dwindling band of actual communicants on each occasion.”—“Church Times,” 26th September 1879.

As regards English Ordinations, concerning which some new facts are brought to light in the following pages—putting aside both historical and theological dissertations, which might apparently be carried on without profit or conviction to either phalanx of disputants, until the Day of Doom—it is self-evident that the moral argument in favour of their validity is certainly very strong; perhaps stronger than either the theological or historical argument. When the frightful state of degradation into which the National Church during Elizabeth’s reign had been brought is honestly contemplated; and when the striking contrast between its position then and its altered state now is duly realized,—the manner in which so much that had been then cast away as value-

abolished by Act of Parliament; while those priests who were found celebrating it were drawn, hung, and quartered. Grindal, Pilkington, and Sandys had no more intention of “saying Mass” than they had of restoring circumcision.

less is now sought after and has been once more secured; the beautiful restoration of Cathedrals, Abbeys, and Parish Churches, the rebuilding of new ones after Catholic models; the renewed interest in all ecclesiastical subjects by an earnest and self-denying minority; the restored worship, the living zeal, the obvious results,—we may reasonably infer, (though there be no exact precedent nor perfect parallel in past history for the complex character and unique* position of the Established Church of England,) that, as Divine Grace has never been withdrawn from her crippled rulers, so an inherent and essential distinction between clergy and laity has been in the main consistently and continually remarked and admitted.

If the Author's intention had been to rake up old scandals, the materials for which are at hand and in abundance, it might have been done with

* "The results of the religious movement of the time had taken shape under the resolute but cautious hand of the Queen [Elizabeth] in a *Church polity, which was thought at the time, and has proved to be, unique*; but which has also proved singularly suited to the character of the English nation."—"Hooker," edited by R. W. Church, p. 5, Introduction. Oxford: 1868.

ease. But this, in the main, has been carefully and charitably avoided. For such work would have been in every way distasteful to him. It is only where disagreeable features serve to give an accurate impression of the period under description that he has not shrunk from recording bare and obvious facts. This was absolutely necessary in some few cases, for so many historical romancers have shovelled aside all distasteful incidents and events, and have only told their story—a story in more senses than one—from its sunshiny side,—suppressing, perverting, and misleading,—that it was consequently essential rather to be fair, honest, and faithful, than one-sided, over-picturesque, and false. For until the true nature and virulence of a disease is seen, no adequate remedy can be applied, and no cure looked for.

There are a considerable number of foot-notes in the following pages, because many of the statements made in the narrative needed to be maintained by careful and exact quotations. These foot-notes might have been largely increased from various sources, more especially from the State Papers, recent Catholic publications, and private MSS.; but, though the author has abun-

dant authority for each and every assertion made by him, he has thought it wise to avoid over-weighting what only professes to be an "Historical Sketch" with too many of such quotations.

The Author is considerably indebted to the researches and labours of Brother Henry Foley, S.J., whose "Records of the English Province," in five handsome volumes, full of authentic and out-of-the-way information, will remain as a monument of his most patient and pains-taking labours, and of the noble and charitable deeds of so many eminent and illustrious English members of his great Society. The profound treatise by Harpsfield, Archdeacon of Canterbury, on "The Pretended Divorce of Henry VIII.," so ably edited by the Rev. Nicholas Pocock, of Queen's College, Oxford, has been carefully and profitably studied. He has likewise read with interest, and made use of, the three series entitled "The Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers," edited by the Rev. John Morris—publications of equal value and interest. Dr. Jessopp's "One Generation of a Norfolk House," and the "Douay Diary," have been also studied with interest and profit; for all these recent

volumes throw a strong light on the darkened pages of English History in Queen Elizabeth's reign, and are of considerable value.

F. G. L.

All Saints' Vicarage,
Lambeth,
November 15th, 1879.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Death of Henry VIII.—Edward VI.—Queen Mary's work of Restoration.—Reconciliation under Mary.—Death of Cardinal Pole.—Punishment of perjurors and heretics.—Elizabeth and Lord Seymour of Sudeley.—Her familiarities with Lord Seymour.—Cecil's birth and origin.—His rise, arts, and influence.—His selfish and tortuous policy.—Character of Sir Francis Walsingham.—How free nations lose their liberties.—Proclamation of the Supreme Head.—Arrival of Protestant exiles.—Various outrages of the Gospellers.—John Knox on the Rule of a Woman.—He flatters Elizabeth's vanity.—The Queen consults Dr. Dee the astrologer.—The Procession of Recognition.—City decorations.—Her reception by the citizens.—The "Liber Regalis."—Her coronation by Oglethorpe.—Old ceremonies observed.—She takes the customary oaths.—The unction disliked.—Due observance of ancient rites.—The imprisoned Evangelists.—Parliament recommends marriage.—Elizabeth legitimized by Act of Parliament.—Invested with spiritual

jurisdiction.—Existing traditions of the Supremacy.—Feckenham condemns revolution.—The Supremacy a special grant.—New punishments appointed.—Archbishop Heath's declaration.—The warnings of Bishop Scott.—“Questions and advices.”—The Second Prayer Book restored.—The Mass mutilated.—Character of the New Prayer Book.—Changes in the Service Book.—“Communion-boards” introduced.—Massing-cups abolished in the Supper.—Occasional services mutilated.—Rites, services, and ceremonies abolished.—Opposition of the Lords Spiritual.—The Bishops' Profession of Faith.—Disputation at Westminster.—The various theologians engaged.—White and Watson committed to prison.—Act of Uniformity.—The celebration of Mass ceases.—Opposition of the bishops.—Character of Bishops Heath and Bonner.—Bonner unfairly maligned.—Character of Bishops Tonstall and White.—Baynes, Scott, Oglethorpe, and Watson.—Matthew Parker elected Archbishop.—Letters Patent.—Old suffragan bishops then living.—No legal consecration-service existing.—No archbishop nor four bishops to be had.—Commission to consecrate Parker.—The Nag's Head fable.—Parker consecrated at Lambeth.—Details of the rite.—Importance of Barlow's consecration.—Parker confirms the elections of Barlow and Scory . . . *pages 1-68*

CHAPTER II.

Grindal writes to Hubert.—Proclamation concerning Religion.—Gross tactics of the Innovators.—The Sacraments disparaged.—Revolt of sacrilege at Canterbury.—Punishments for the same.—The Reformation and Great

Rebellion.—The new Oath of Homage.—Foreign Protestants provided for.—French preachers imported.—Foreign Protestants banished.—Denunciation of this act.—Pope Pius IV.'s Letter to the Queen.—Consecration of new bishops.—Caution of Cecil.—Deplorable condition of the churches.—The old clergy scattered.—The new method of preaching.—New and "godly" Homilies.—Celebration of "The Lord's Supper."—The communicants helped themselves.—Further innovations recommended.—The changes unpopular.—The New Oath tendered to the clergy.—The Supreme Governness unrecognized as such.—Catholics persecuted and scattered.—Exiles in Flanders and Italy.—Resistance to the innovations.—The new orders suspected.—Difficulties concerning ordinations.—The fact of Parker's consecration.—His archiepiscopal Register.—Difficulties in the same.—Original documents contradictory.—The charge of forgery.—Married prelates disliked.—The Queen's Injunctions.—Matrimonial inquisitions.—Her Majesty's edict about marriage.—Deplorable state of Ely Cathedral.—Mass still said in secret.—The Queen visits Canterbury.—The Geneva Bible.—Laxity in faith and morals.—The Queen and her nobility consult the astrologers.—Necromancers and conjurers become popular.—Fond and fantastical prophecies.—Deplorable state of the country.—The Bishop's Visitation Articles.—Powerlessness of the new prelates.—Ignorance of the hysterical preachers.—Lax notions concerning ordination.—The "call" held to be essential.—Character of the newly-arranged service.—The Cross a stumbling-block.—The Queen's birthday made a festival.—Erastianism, Irreligion, and Indifference.—Rivalry between church and ale-house.—No consecration in "the Supper."—Current heresies and blasphemy.—Bishop Pilkington's profanity.—The new "Service of the Supper."—The

Bible and Prayer Book translated into Welsh.—State of the Church in Wales.—The Establishment of to-day.—Work of the General Councils.—The Council of Trent.—Importance of that Council.—Its direct effects *pages 69–139*

CHAPTER III.

Decision at the Council of Trent.—Division between Catholics and Erastians.—Sir William Cecil's Report.—Divergencies in the New Service.—Protestant Maxim.—Great destitution of the poor.—The Queen's visit to Cambridge.—A play in King's College Chapel.—Her Majesty's love affairs.—Sir William Pickering and the Earl of Arundel.—The latter resigns his office.—The Lord Robert Dudley.—The Queen tickles him.—Coolness between the Queen and Leicester.—Her true affection for him.—Leicester's new sleeping-apartment.—Her treatment of Archbishop Heath.—Ordered to be "less straitened."—Suspicious regarding him.—Controversy concerning ministers' apparel.—The surplice disused by many.—Fierce and furious controversies.—Printers and booksellers restrained.—Rise and progress of Nonconformity.—Rigid uniformity enforced.—The case of Horne against Bonner.—The new ordinations condemned.—Parliament confirms the new orders.—Impotence of Parliament in the question.—Special Act concerning ordination.—The new supremacy unprecedented.—Apologies for her office of Supreme Governess.—A plea for the Old Churchmen.—Dr. William Allen.—He describes the situation.—The Catholics driven to desperation.—Further persecutions and imprisonments.—Dissatisfaction in Yorkshire, Durham, and Northumberland.—Rising under the Northern

Earls.—The nobility advocate open resistance.—High Mass restored at Durham.—Rejoicing of the people.—Defeat of the Pilgrims of Grace.—The poor severely punished.—Hangings, butcheries, and tortures.—Lord Sussex is too humane.—Chivalry of the Northern nobility.—Pope Pius V. issues his Bull of Excommunication.—Jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff.—St. Austin's relation to Rome.—Exact terms of the Bull.—Fresh raid upon the beggars.—The poor kept out of the Queen's sight.—Sufferings and privations of the poor.—Contrast of the Past with the Present.—The poor hunted, stocked, and flogged *pages 140-199*

CHAPTER IV.

Beggars flogged and branded.—The Pope's knowledge of affairs.—Queen Elizabeth's bishops unprecedented.—The ancient priests and new ministers.—True state of ecclesiastical affairs.—The new ministers ignorant.—Sermon-hearers moved to laughter and ribaldry.—Laymen appointed to benefices.—The farmers of benefices and their hirelings.—Their plans and policy.—The case of Thomas Lancaster.—Appointed Archbishop of Armagh.—True character of the bishops.—Their greediness, self-seeking, and robberies.—Pilkington amasses great riches.—Disagreement between Sandys and Grindal.—Sandys marries two wives.—Sir John Bourne and Bishop Sandys.—Mistress Sandys disparaged.—Sandys translated to London.—Then translated to York.—Holds a Visitation at Doncaster.—Sandys and the innkeeper's wife.—Sir Robert Stapleton imprisoned.—Character of Bishop Bale.—Sometime Bishop of Ossory.—Coarseness of his language.—His opinions.—His published writings.—Scurrility and heresy of the same.—The bishops obe-

dient and obsequious.—The Queen grants dispensations.—Instrument of Archbishop Grindal's resignation.—State of the Northern towns.—Condition of Norwich Cathedral.—State of the city of Norwich.—Bishop John Parkhurst.—State of the diocese of Norwich.—Sir W. Cecil blames Parkhurst.—State of the diocese of Carlisle.—Bishop Rowland Meyrick.—State of the diocese of Bangor.—State of the diocese of Litchfield.—State of the churches in general.—State of the diocese of Oxford.—Bishop John Underhill.—The Cathedral of St. Frideswide.—Effects of the Reformation.—State of the diocese of St. David's.—Visitation Articles.—Bishop Middleton's Injunctions.—Ancient rites and reverence forbidden.—Changes in funeral ceremonies.—Old burial customs abolished.—Representations of the Queen's Coat of Arms and of Moses and Aaron.—State of the diocese of Lincoln.—Its extent and natural characteristics.—The ancient see of Dorchester.—Abbeys and hospitals of Lincolnshire.—The old nobility found wanting.—Risings in Berks, Hants, and Oxon.—Unlawful assemblies forbidden.—Justice and True Religion dethroned.—Bullingham's heresy and sacrilege.—Destruction under Archdeacon Aylmer.—Inventory of monuments of superstition. Altar-slabs grossly profaned.—Reforms at Ashby, Bardney, and Belton.—Revolting desecration.—Desecration at Croxbie and Durlington.—The Vicar of Haconbie's sacrilege.—Sacrilege at Horblinge and Langtoft.—Altar linen made into shirts and smocks.—Such destruction very general.—Entirely approved of by the bishops.—The Present and Past again contrasted.—Almost miraculous change for the better.—Improvement in the Episcopate.—Improvements in the Established Church *pages 200-276*

CHAPTER V.

The Pope's Bull affixed to the gates of the Bishop of London's Palace—John Felton is tried for high treason.—His execution.—Elizabeth professes to despise the Pope's action.—He acts as Father of the Christian Family.—Parker and others suggest contempt for the Bull.—Insurrection of John Throckmorton.—Fresh enactments against supporters of the Old Religion.—Sanguinary tyranny of the Queen.—The Queen's Government a despotism.—The Queen's New Religion.—The Court of High Commission.—The nation sick at heart.—Character of the new nobility.—Case of Dr. John Storey.—Dismembered, disembowelled, and beheaded.—Death and burial of Bishop Bonner.—Death and burial of Bishop Thirlby.—The Puritan "Admonition to Parliament."—Publications of the Puritans.—The bishops and Church government attacked.—Thomas Cartwright and his policy.—Controversy concerning rochets, surplices, and chimeres.—Secular pomp and extravagance of the bishops.—Humiliating position of Archbishop Parker.—Evil precedents of Cranmer.—His cruelties and mode of punishing heretics.—A local Church readily dominated.—Elizabeth appoints Church Commissioners.—Doings of Strickland and Snagg.—Difficulties of the English Catholics.—Increased boldness of the innovators.—Abolition of the Christian Sacrifice.—Fresh legislation.—High treason to say Mass: felony to hear mass.—Consequences of this new legislation.—Convocation packed and manipulated.—The officers and furniture of the churches.—Position of the Parish Clerk.—Old rites in some places traditionally observed.—Funeral customs and ceremonies still in use.—Certain important traditions crushed out.—Decency and order attempted.—Absentees from church noted down.—Bishop Pilkington's opinions.—Confirmation now

become a rite.—Consequent disuse of Confirmation.—
State and dignity of Bishop Whitgift.—New Injunctions
issued.—Disorganization and disorder rampant.—Many
of the beneficed clergy unordained.—Such persons tole-
rated.—Confusion wrought by the Puritans.—Each
bishop assumes quasi-Papal authority.—The Bishops'
Courts and their officers.—Concessions to the Puritans.
—Episcopal ordination not then essential.—Neglect of
the warnings of the old and faithful bishops.—England
visibly separated from the rest of Christendom.—The
True source of Authority.—All authority weakened.—
Consequences of the Reformation.—False principles cur-
rent and dangerous.—Modern progress and culture.—
The glad tidings of fire, sword, and force *pages 277-326*

THE CHURCH

UNDER

QUEEN ELIZABETH.

CHAPTER I.

HENRY VIII. had died, in despair, a dreadful death, terrible to have looked upon, on January 28, 1547; was buried with pomp and ceremony at Windsor, and then speedily forgotten. The prayers and masses which, by his long and elaborate Will, he had so earnestly desired might be said for his soul in perpetuity, were never said at all. The desolator of other men's graves, and, worse than this, of God's sanctuaries, was thus himself left desolate and unremembered in a deserted sanctuary where the lamps had been put out, and from which the Adorable Presence had departed.

Then as to his children. Edward VI., a sickly,

fanatical, and debilitated youth,—bred in heresy, brought up in schism, flattered by those who ought to have known better,* and pampered with cant; until, under such tuition, he had become an offensive and unbearable prig,—was happily removed by Providence to another world in the midst of his Protestant uncle's disreputable and disastrous rule, and before further and greater evils for the nation had been sealed.

Queen Mary, King Henry's lawful daughter, did a noble work in restoring to the Church tithes and first-fruits, in bringing back certain of the religious orders, such as the Benedictines and Bridgetines, to their old homes, and in vainly endeavouring to stem the tide of innovation, error, and profanity. She duly deposed some of the bishops, who, having been monks, had broken their vows of celibacy and chastity—amongst

* Roger Ascham, when writing to the Duke of Somerset, in 1547, spoke of the King as a juvenile Josiah, a virginal youth, so pure in himself, and so perfect in the new gospel, that he could not be suspected even of the smallest inclination towards, or attachment for, the Whore of Babylon. On another occasion (A.D. 1550), Cranmer made himself ridiculous by the following outrageous flattery, which he personally put forth to Cheke, the young king's tutor:—"Ah, Master Cheke, you may be glad all the days of your life that you have such a scholar; for *he hath more divinity in his little finger than all we (the bishops) have in our bodies.*"—Preface to "Foreign Kalendar," by J. Stevenson, p. xlvii.

whom were John Bird and Robert Holgate.* More especially does she merit the sincerest admiration from all who believe in One Body, One Spirit, and one hope of the Christian calling, for having, under lawful Authority, visibly reunited desolate England to the rest of Christendom once again. The service of reconciliation in Westminster Abbey on November 30th, 1554, when the Cardinal-Archbishop of Canterbury solemnly absolved the nation from its sin of schism, was

* "We need not delay long over these two names. Holgate of York, and Bird of Chester, were respectively a Gilbertine monk and a Carmelite friar, and as such had, amongst other vows, taken the vow of celibacy. Holgate married after he was appointed to York, as he himself alleges, to please the Duke of Somerset. Protestants give him the character of being covetous and worldly-minded; and Burnet admits that though he went along with Cranmer, who got him promoted from Landaff to York, yet he was no credit to the Reformation. He has left little or nothing by which his opinions may be ascertained, and the principal thing known to his discredit was the claim preferred against him at the council-board of Edward VI., by one, Norman, that he had carried off his wife. The Council, that could wink at Poynet's peccadilloes, was not likely to be hard upon Holgate. They contented themselves with forbidding him to come to Parliament, and then never troubled their heads any more about the matter. He lived just long enough to be deprived (March 16th, 1554) by Mary, on the same plea with Bird of Chester and the Bishops of St. David's and Bristol, viz. that they had married."—The Reformers of the Reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., "Union Review," vol. viii. p. 526. London: 1870.

the public ratification of a grand deed of Christian charity done in her reign, which, in the great and terrible Day when all works are to be tested, shall surely be found to cover a multitude of sins; and which, even in our own national life and history, may yet render her pleasant name—"the sweetest name that ever woman bore,"—so much and so unjustly maligned, sweet to the memory of all who, notwithstanding divisions in the sad origin of which they had no share, still claim the sacred and honoured appellation of Catholic, and are constantly labouring and praying for the gift of visible unity once more upon earth.

Queen Mary at length found that peace which, by experience, so many discover for themselves the World cannot give, for she died on Thursday, November 17, 1558, on which day Cardinal Reginald Pole went likewise to his blessed and well-earned reward.* Of his Eminence, Edwin Sandys, in a letter to Bullinger, dated 20th December of the same year, thus sneeringly wrote: "That good cardinal, that he might not raise any disturbance or impede the progress of the gospel, departed this life after his friend Mary,

* There remains an interesting and well-painted portrait of the Cardinal, in his official robes, in the dining-hall of Lambeth Palace.

‘*Maria sua.*’ Such was the love and harmony between them, that not even Death itself could separate them. We have nothing, therefore, to fear from Pole, for ‘dead men do not bite.’” *

This pious queen has been often severely blamed for her punishment of heretics, and this, not because she caused to be made new and exceptional laws to meet exceptional and unusual difficulties (never the case), but because she could not and did not hinder the lawful authorities from putting into execution very severe laws, long in force and which then existed. A malefactor who, in cold blood, poisons a man or cuts off his head is even now righteously hung. Those decreasing few, who still believe that the spirit of a man is of more importance than his flesh—that the life to come is of more value than the life that now is; that to poison the soul is at least as heinous a crime as to poison the body—may not, after all, be so irrational or eccentric as they are unjustly assumed to be; if, while murder, rebellion, and rapine are still severely punished by modern law, they hold that treason, heresy, and perjury deservedly received, under Queen Mary, equally severe punishments.

When Elizabeth, the King’s natural daughter by Anne Boleyn, was in her teens, her bearing

* “Zurich Letters,” vol. i. No. 2.

towards the other sex had been, to say the least, unusual and remarkable. Various queer and perhaps questionable stories had been afloat regarding her, some of which were possibly false, and others certainly exaggerated. But in one notable case this was not so. Her conduct in relation to Lord Seymour of Sudeley, the Lord Admiral, a married man, in the highest degree reprehensible, caused very grave scandal. But perhaps the chief fault lay with his lordship, and not mainly with the young princess. He is believed by many to have contracted a marriage with Katherine Parr, Henry VIII.'s widow, for convenience' sake, and in order to be near Elizabeth, who resided with, and was under the care of, her step-mother. At the period in question, though Elizabeth was barely fifteen years of age, she was as forward and precocious in knowledge as she was altogether lacking in feminine delicacy and maidenly modesty. The familiarities of Lord Seymour which she tolerated were simply disgusting. Elizabeth actually allowed him to enter her sleeping-chamber in his bed-gown and slippers only, before she was out of bed in the morning, and there to indulge in acts and actions gross in the extreme. He struck her with his palms on the back and other parts of her undraped body, and when she rollickingly rolled about under the disordered sheets, or, hastily

slipping out of bed, laughingly hid herself behind the damask curtains, he toyed with her anew both by word and deed, by gross inuendos, scandalous questions of double meaning, and other indelicate words and acts. Queen Katherine Parr, aroused by jealousy, coming upon them suddenly one day at Seymour Place, found the princess on her husband's knees, with his left arm round her waist. On this she sent the princess away towards the close of the month of May 1548; but what she had seen and knew, affecting her mind and health, so harassed her, poor lady! that she soon afterwards died in childbirth. This death happened so opportunely for the Lord Admiral's obvious purpose as regards the princess, that the malice of his enemies attributed the timely but sudden decease of his wife, the Lady Katherine, to poison.

During the latter years of Mary's reign several needy and adventurous politicians, who, under Edward VI., had already risen by self-assertion, knavery, and craft to positions of some influence, secretly offered their services to Elizabeth. Most of them were of low birth and origin. One of these, Sir William Cecil,* was the son of a well-to-do

* One writer, the learned and anonymous author of "Responsio ad Edictum Eliz. Reg.," published at Augsburg in 1592, asserts that Cecil's father held an inferior situation

Lincolnshire yeoman, subsequently an inn-holder at Stamford, who, because of his youthful good looks, had been made page to Henry VIII. This page's only son, a shrewd, cold, and calculating person, knighted in 1551—but better known as Lord Burghley, a title which he subsequently received on February 25, 1571, together with the Garter—saw exactly how the land lay, and discovered, as he imagined, a fair chance of further temporal advancement. Educated at Gray's Inn, he had been sometime private secretary to the Duke of Somerset, and was afterwards made that nobleman's "Master of requests." At that period he masqueraded as a zealous Reformer, was in confidential communication with the Zwinglian heretics, and ostentatiously declared that he thirsted for what they called "the pure milk of the Word," meaning thereby the blasphemous glosses and odious caricatures of Christianity in which these repulsive and dangerous people delighted. In 1548 he had held a secretaryship of state. On the timely death of Edward, however, like many others, Cecil at once changed his tactics when Mary became Queen. Then, dropping the heretics, and having avoided Lady Jane Grey, he appeared as

in the office of the Royal Wardrobe; that his grandfather kept an inn at Stamford, and was afterwards one of the Royal Guards.

a devout and zealous Catholic. In the silver and velvet gypcyre at his side he carried, and frequently produced, the "Hours of Our Lady," and muttering his devotions, ostentatiously used his large-beaded rosary. But Mary was not to be duped. Knowing his antecedents, she never trusted him. To Elizabeth, however, he proved to be welcome. For, passing over her natural and proper advisers, the old nobility of blood and good repute, she at once appointed him Lord Treasurer of her household and Chief Minister of State. On the very day of her accession, before she started for London, he had presented to her twelve "Minutes of Subjects," needing, as he asserted, Her Grace's instant consideration; while, four days afterwards, he was sworn of her Privy Council. He was thus taken into her confidence. At once he urged her to put away without delay all those who had occupied places of influence under the late queen, some of whom he feared; suggesting that their places be supplied by "men meaner in substance and younger in years"—advice which she certainly took. In order to overawe and compass efficiently the degradation of the Catholic clergy, he suggested that Her Majesty, striking boldly and sharply, should promptly involve them in the disagreeable meshes of a *præmunire*; while, on the other hand, in order to terrify the more rampant and

unscrupulous innovators—the communistic Protestants and Hot Gospellers—who threatened to become a nuisance and a danger, he recommended the immediate enactment of a sharp law against public assemblies.

Under his advice the kingdom was brought into sore troubles and great straits. Under the plea of serving his royal mistress and benefitting the State, he pursued with art so tortuous a policy that bribes to secure supporters of it, and acts of corruption and venality, were again and again repeated. He carefully enriched himself,* ruined his enemies, and rewarded his friends. By his instrumentality true Liberty was banished. There was no fear of God before his eyes; for, more than any other man then living, he deliberately sealed the irreligious division between England and the rest of Christendom, and left our dis-

* He contrived to secure for himself the greater part of the endowments of the Abbey of Peterborough, which formed an adequate estate with which to support his new dignity of a peer, which later on he received. But he was not content with these, for, as Dr. Peter Heylyn wrote,—“During the vacancy of the See of Norwich, and during his (Dr. Scambler’s) incumbency, Sir William Cecil, Principal Secretary of State, possessed himself of the best manors in the Soke, which belonged to it; and for his (the bishop’s) readiness to confirm them to him, he preferred him to the See of Norwich.”

tracted nation a prey to every kind of ambitious and crooked-minded adventurer who thought fit to set up as a reformer of religion or a self-appointed concoctor of new forms of misbelief. In fine, he was one of those keen-sighted worthies, condemned rather than commended by an Apostle, who think that gain is godliness.*

Another State official of almost equal influence to that wielded by Cecil was his fellow Secretary of State, Sir Francis Walsingham. For art in corrupting others, and skill in elevating treachery to the dignity of a science, for ability in planning and carrying out forgery, as well as in arranging for the assassination of inconvenient allies or open enemies, he was vastly superior to Cecil, as will ere long be discovered; for, while his hypocrisy was consummate, his ability and dexterity were obviously greater, and his general success consequently very considerable. He was of an exceedingly savage nature. It was evidently a pleasure to him, however strange, to inflict personal cruelty upon any supposed enemy who might chance to be in his power. When prisoners of the old faith, later on, were brought before him in his judicial capacity, or for due and careful examination, he would sometimes kick and cuff them in a

* 1 Timothy vi. 5.

passion, or strike them heavily with his staff; while, if they hesitated to convict themselves, the numerous rude epithets he made use of were frequently disgusting, and his oaths equalled in coarseness, though in repulsiveness rarely surpassed, those which so frequently glided glibly off the compressed and pursed-up lips of his royal mistress.

Such tools, tactics, and events served once more and anew to point out to the educated and more thoughtful how true was Plato's expressive saying of old,* that free nations have seldom lost their liberties by conquest, but chiefly at the hands of low-born and unscrupulous men who have ridden into power upon the tumultuous waves of popular passion.

The Queen, being present at the Bishop of Carlisle's mass, soon after her accession,—on Christmas morning, as some assert, and while the cantors of her chapel were singing the *Gloria in excelsis* at their lectern,—sent a messenger to his lordship within the sanctuary peremptorily forbidding him to elevate the Host.† But Oglethorpe replied

* "Plato's Republic," viii. 562; sec. 99.

† "Nothing, however, has yet been publicly determined with respect to the abolishing Popish superstition, and the re-establishment of the Christian religion. There is, how-

that, as it was the unvarying rule of the Catholic Church for all priests to do so, he must ask Her Majesty's permission to allow him to conform. Upon this, before the Gospel, and at once, without further parley, she rose from her faldstool, biting her thin lips in anger, and, motioning her attendants to follow, re-clasped her book of devotions, stamped vigorously on the floor, and so hastily departed. This incident, obviously pre-arranged, was much discussed and commented on by many. The bishops duly noted it.

On the 27th of December, at Cecil's instigation, exercising her assumed office of Supreme Spiritual Head of the Church of England, she issued a Proclamation throughout both the Provinces of Canterbury and York, formally and distinctly forbidding any elevation of the Blessed Sacrament by any of her priests. Her chaplain, Minter, saying mass in her presence on the morning of the same day, duly and dutifully observed his Sovereign's commands.* In the same Proclama-

ever, a general expectation that all rites and ceremonies will shortly be reformed by our faithful citizens and other godly men in the afore-mentioned Parliament, either after the pattern which was lately in use in the time of King Edward the Sixth, or which is set forth by the Protestant princes of Germany in the above-named Confession of Augsburg."—Richard Hilles to Bullinger, dated February 28, 1559. "Zurich Letters," 2nd Series, No. 7.

* *Vide* "Laderchius," iii. p. 204, and Tierney's edition of Dod's "Church History," vol. ii. p. 124.

tion—as a temporary makeshift, until the old and sacred rites brought back under Queen Mary were again abolished by Parliamentary authority—the Supreme Governness graciously permitted the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, as well as the Litany, to be said or sung in the vulgar tongue.

At Sandwich, Dover, and Canterbury, the Protestant exiles arrived in force and high spirits, and were noisy and triumphant in their bearing. If Jewell may be trusted, the Queen was extremely gratified by their return, and expressed her satisfaction.* Afterwards, however, Her Highness had some reason for changing her mind concerning the value of their presence and labours. Some of them, in their enthusiasm at her accession, made a disturbance during mass in the parish church of Dover, hurling a missal† during the elevation at the head of the celebrant, whom they termed “a cursed popish dog,” “a shaveling,” “an Antichrist,” and an “idol-smacker.”‡

* “We hear that their return was very acceptable to the Queen, and that she openly declared her satisfaction.”—Letter from John Jewell to Peter Martyr, dated January 26, 1559, “Zurich Letters,” vol. i. No. 3.

† Some writers say it was a breviary. But as it was taken off the cushion on a side altar, it was most probably a missal.

‡ “Ape of Antichrist,” “mass-monger,” “Balaamite,” “abbey-lubber,” were some of the other choice names given

Without authority, the Zwinglian service-book of Edward VI. was again brought into requisition in several places. Legally-instituted clergy were hooted at, spat upon, and persecuted ; so that they were unable to minister in public. Several images of our Divine Lord, His Blessed Mother, and the Saints, were violently wrenched down from the rood screens and treated with obscene indignities. At Canterbury, as a deliberate act of contempt, a holy-oil stock was emptied of its sacred contents, in order to grease the creaking wheels of a wainman's cart, which had come in from the adjacent village of Harbledown. At Brentford, at the same time, an indignity too disgusting for words was perpetrated in the font of the parish church by one of the new gospellers, as a practical protest against the religion of Bede, St. Anselm, and Sir Thomas More. The Babel-voices of noisy controversialists,* young as well as old, everywhere rose anew ; while furious

to those who clung to the ancient faith. I have gathered both these and those in the text above from the MS. correspondence and Protestant literature of the day.

* "They held arguments also among themselves about the meaning of various scripture texts, all of them, men and women, girls and boys, labourers, workmen, and simpletons ; and these discussions were often wont, as it was said, to produce quarrels and fights."—"Life of William Weston," p. 241. London: 1875.

preachers, with screaming voices and deep maledictions for their opponents, went so far in creating serious riots* at Oxford, Newark, and Chichester, as that the existing authorities of those places had to step in and keep the peace by armed force, amongst these energetic evangelists of "another gospel which is not another."

During Edward's reign, or possibly later, John Knox, the so-called "Reformer," had written a treatise,† in his vigorous but coarse and illogical style, indirectly aimed at Mary Tudor, directly at Mary Stuart, maintaining that the rule of a woman was "repugnant to nature, a contumely to God, a thing most contrarious to His revealed Will and approved ordinances, and finally the subversion of all equity and justice." Elizabeth, of course, knew of this treatise, which is a wonderful production for its sanctimonious language, but did

* "On the other (the Protestant) side many were raised to great preferments, who, having spent their time of exile in such foreign churches (!!) as followed the platform of Geneva, returned so disaffected to episcopal government with the rites and ceremonies here by law established, as not long after filled the Church with most sad disorders; not only to the breaking of the bond of peace, but to the grieving and extinguishing the spirit of unity."—"The History of Queen Elizabeth," by Peter Heylyn, p. 115. London: 1671.

† "A First Blaste of the Trumpett against the Monstrous Regimen of Women," by John Knox.

not at all appreciate either its logic or rhetoric. Knox, when brought into communication with her, boldly got over the difficulty not by giving up his principle, but by maintaining that the Queen was a remarkable and obvious exception to the general rule. Her whole life, he pointed out in writing, had been so blessed and favoured of God Almighty, she was so overflowing with grace, she had been so evidently elected by Him, and specially preserved for His chosen people, that what was unlawful and unnatural in all other women was perfectly lawful and even desirable in her. This appeared to satisfy her temporarily, though it is more than probable, as Sir William Throckmorton pointed out, that the political services of Knox were still required, and therefore that his printed insults should be overlooked:—"Considering what Knoakes is hable to doo in Scotlande, which is verie muche, all this turmoil there being stirred up as it is, it shuld stande your Majestie instead (if) his former faultes were forgotten."

Before determining the exact day for her coronation, the Queen sent her favourite, Robert Dudley, to consult the well-known and notorious necromancer and astrologer, Dr. Dee,* to whom Her

* *Vide* Godwin's "Life of Dr. Dee," *in loco*. This also is clear from the actual entries in Dr. Dee's Diary and writings, from which the following is taken:—"Her Majestie refused

Majesty, having privately renounced the sacrament of penance and its competent ministers, often went for advice, and with whom she held close conversations,—a notable case of degeneracy; and proving that, when the Christian faith in its integrity is mutilated by choice or cast aside, gross superstition often takes its place. Dr. Dee then dwelt at a small house, close to the water-side and no great distance from the parish church of Mortlake.* On her personal application, through

to come in; but willed to fetch my glass so famous, and to show her some of the properties of it, which I did: her Majestie being taken down from her horse by the Earle of Leicester, Master of the Horse, at the church wall of Mortlake, did see some of the properties of that glasse, to her Majestie's great contentment and delight."—Dr. Dee's "Compendious Memorial," p. 516. When Lord Leicester and Lord Laskey dined with Dee (A.D. 1583), he was not sufficiently well off to provide a suitable repast, so the Queen, who was at Sion House, hearing of it, sent him "forty angels of gold." In 1592 Mr. Thomas George brought him "an hundred marks from her Majestie." "1577. Nov. 22nd, I rod to Windsor to the Q. Majestie. Nov. 25th, I spake with the Quene *hora quinta*. Nov. 28th, I spake with the Quene *hora quinta*. I spake with Mr. Secretary Walsingham" (Ashmole asserts that this person was one of Dee's greatest patrons). . . . "1578. Oct. 8th, the Quene's Majesty had conference with me at Richemond inter 9 et 11. . . . 1580. The Quene's Majestie, to my great comfort (*hora quinta*), came with her trayn from the court, and at my dore graciously calling me to her on horseback."—"Dr. John Dee's Diary." Camden Society. London: 1842.

* MSS. Ashmol. No. 1788. fol. 149.

Dudley, Dr. Dee informed her that Sunday, the 15th of January, was undoubtedly a lucky day ; and so, with the sanction of her Council, the ceremony was appointed to be then performed.

On Thursday, the 12th, Her Majesty consequently proceeded from Westminster to the Tower preparatory to the grand and customary " procession of recognition."

On the 14th of January, leaving the Tower about two o'clock in the afternoon, the Queen passed through the City back to Westminster, according to ancient precedent. Her coach, covered with crimson velvet, and richly caparisoned horses, were surrounded by a well-ordered cavalcade of state officers and attendants, all magnificently attired. Eight knights bore a broad canopy of cloth-of-gold over her. She was almost everywhere greeted with acclamations by the curious and interested crowds which thronged Cheapside and Fleet Street, or ranged themselves in front of the mansions of the nobility in the Strand. Before she started, her ladies-in-waiting heard her piously and complacently compare herself to Daniel delivered from the den of lions, and thank God out-loud for His providential care of her.*

* Holinshed's "Chronicles," vol. ii. p. 1787, &c.

The rich decorations in Fenchurch and Gracechurch streets were continuous. Triumphal arches with complimentary allegorical representations, which were supposed to be explained by the recitation of wordy verses, were the scenes of much applause from dense crowds. In Cheapside, a stage had been erected and adorned, where eight little children personified the Beatitudes, and expressed a hope, in rugged but honest verse, that God would make her strong and bestow His blessing.

This part of the City was decorated with sumptuousness and taste. Here the rich mercers dwelt in quaint and picturesque gabled houses, one story overhanging another; all the walls and windows of which were tastefully adorned with carpets, costly hangings, streamers, banners, and tapestries; and from which crowds in holiday attire looked down upon the moving pageant with smiles and greetings. Here, too, the City authorities, who had been efficiently stirred up to do their duty by Cecil, had gathered in their picturesque and effective official dresses—before vulgarity was rampant and good taste had quite decayed—headed by the Recorder, Sir Ranulph Cholmely, who, in the name of the Lord Mayor and citizens, offered Her Majesty as their gift a crimson satin purse containing a thousand marks in gold. This was graciously accepted, and Elizabeth then promised

to be a good queen to all her people—a promise that was certainly not kept for any length of time.

A halt was made, by previous appointment, at a triumphal arch near St. Paul's, where in the cold January air a female child, half-draped, in accordance with the revived Paganism of that day, and let down by silken cords from above, came forward with rehearsed grimaces and exaggerated genuflections to present Her Majesty with a large early copy of the mistranslated Geneva Bible with its wordy preface and Calvinistic notes.

This questionable present she graciously received with bows and other acknowledgments; and then, ostentatiously placing it to her heart, she acknowledged, with condescending smiles, the boisterous applause of Cecil's creatures,—placed there to close this impressive incident in a pre-arranged drama.

As the procession took its way along the Strand westwards, the Tower guns were heard booming in the distance. Darkness soon overspread the city, and the stars came out. Her Majesty rested that night in the palace at Whitehall, and prepared herself for the solemnities of the morrow.

The Queen, as will be seen, was crowned at Westminster by Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle. It seems more than probable that up to the latest hours of the previous Saturday evening, though

several had been tampered with and tested, no bishop* could be thoroughly relied upon to perform the act; for, early on Sunday morning, it became necessary to hastily borrow from Bonner, the Bishop of London, suitable episcopal vestments for the officiating prelate. This necessary part of the solemnity could hardly, therefore, have been finally arranged until the small hours of the night. Oglethorpe, after great persuasion, had consented; but he stood alone, and soon repented of his act and deed. In the Abbey there remained, as there still remains, an old literary treasure, the "Liber Regalis," possibly used at the coronation of Richard II. and his Queen, containing "Ordo consecrandi Reginam solam," which, after it had been inspected by Sir William Cecil,—five of whose MS. notes may still be read on its thick vellum folios—was by him approved and made use of by Oglethorpe in the ceremony.†

* In an existing record of the Coronation in the Ashmolean MSS. now in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, other bishops are mentioned as being present. If so, these were no doubt those guilty of treasonable acts and heresy, who had gone abroad in Mary's reign, and had now hastily returned.

† "Liber Regalis, seu Ordo Consecrandi Regem solum: Ordo consecrandi reginam cum Rege: Ordo consecrandi reginam solam. Rubrica de Regiis exequiis, è codice Westmonasteriensi Editus."—Printed for the Roxburgh Club (at the cost of Frederick, Earl Beauchamp). London: 1870.

This book is the copy of an office of the fourteenth century, with special rubrics applicable to the coronation of kings and queens in the Benedictine Abbey of Westminster, and was no doubt prepared for the actual use of the officiating prelate on such occasions.

The Abbey Church, where all the Catholic *ornamenta* remained, had been arranged for the ceremony in accordance with recognized tradition; though, on account of the exhausted state of the Treasury, the ceremonial was shorn of some of its ancient splendour. Early in the morning the Queen came in the royal barge from Whitehall to Westminster, where the populace and specially the Protestant and Reforming part of it, had gathered to greet her with acclamations and applause.

She was met in Westminster Hall by the Bishop of Carlisle, vested in cope and mitre, and bearing a pastoral staff; and other inferior clergy, in surplices and copes, were in attendance. But none of the diocesan bishops, who were in canonical and lawful possession of their sees, were present. One and all, save Oglethorpe, deliberately and intentionally stayed away. The choristers and clerks of the Royal Chapel in scarlet cassocks and lawn rochets, were there to do their part, and a large cross of silver-gilt was carried at the head of the procession. All the high officers of state

were in attendance, while a canopy of cloth-of-gold was borne over the Queen, as she walked with state and dignity from Westminster Hall to the Abbey, along an appointed pathway railed in and spread with blue cloth powdered with conventional roses.

Within the Abbey, which was crowded, some of the Benedictine monks looking down upon the gay scene from the southern triforium of the choir, as Father Seigebert Bulkeley mentioned, all the detailed rites of the "Liber Regalis" were duly observed—the Recognition, the Proclamation, the customary Offerings, the Oath, and the Unction.* Every step was duly taken in accordance with precedent—as Cecil had enjoined should be the case—and nothing essential or important seems to have been omitted.

The Oath, the Unction, and the actual rite of Consecration were of course details in the sacred service of the most essential and important public character—and were seen and acknowledged so to be, as well by those who favoured the old, as by those who were secretly promoting the advance of the new, religion.

* "In Nomine Patris," &c. "Prosit tibi hæc unctio olei in honorem et confirmationem æternam in sæcula sæculorum. Amen."—"Liber Regalis," *in loco*.

On this occasion, by the advice of Cecil and her new councillors, and in order to secure to herself the Crown without danger of subsequent question or dispute, the Queen had been carefully advised to dissemble falsely, in God's own house and Presence, to swear and forswear, to appear to be what she certainly was not, and to seem to believe in that which she had privately resolved to set aside. Within a few feet of the shrine and sacred relics of the saintly confessor, she openly took the usual solemn and sacred oath of Christian kings,* when it was tendered her, kissing thereupon the precious text of the Holy Gospels, and, in sight of peers and people, promising thereby to defend the Catholic Religion, and to guard faithfully the rights and immunities of God's Holy Church, as all the previous monarchs from the days of St. Edward had each done. The bystanding

* Miss Strickland thus attempts to defend this act:—"It is our duty to our subject to suggest, as her defence from the horrid appearance of wilful perjury, that it is possible she meant at that time to model the Reformed Church she projected, and for which she challenged the appellation of Catholic, as near as possible to the Anglo-Saxon Church."—"Lives of the Queens of England," vol. vi. p. 164. London: 1844. Upon which defence the only remark that need be made is, that, as far as ordinary research has enlightened us, perjury is not known to have been an authorized practice of the Anglo-Saxon Church.

peers heard her repeat the solemn words and saw her do the appointed acts. Any honest "Reformers," so called—and some were certainly present—must surely have been ashamed of the oath she then took, for they well enough knew that she had no intention of keeping it, though not one of them is known to have publicly protested against it.

At the appointed time Elizabeth withdrew with her ladies-in-waiting to be prepared for the act of anointing. This was done on forehead, breast, and hands, as usual; though the Queen does not appear to have much liked the ceremony, for, on retiring again for a few moments afterwards, she, with unpardonable levity, observed to one of her personal attendants that the oil was stinking,* and that she had "much disliked the greasing."

When she returned to the space before the high altar, she was found arrayed in a mantle of cloth-of-gold and ermine: she was then ceremonially

* "She was also anointed, but she disliked the ceremony and ridiculed it; for when she withdrew, according to the custom, to put on the royal garments, it is reported that she said to the noble ladies in attendance upon her, 'Away with you, the oil is stinking.'"—Edward Rishton's "Continuation of Sander's History," edited by David Lewis, M.A., p. 243. London: 1877. "Good News from London," pp. 65, 66. Printed at the sign of the Swan. London: 1675.

girt with a sword, endued with the *armillum* and solemnly crowned. The coronation ring was put on the accustomed finger,* in her right hand was placed the sceptre, in her left the orb. After this the officiating prelate first did homage, followed in order by the peers,† and then solemn high mass was continued. All the ancient rites of the Salisbury Missal were scrupulously observed, save that the Epistle and Gospel were sung in English as well as in Latin, and there was no elevation of the Sacred Host.‡ At the offertory the three state swords were offered, with other customary oblations. Her Majesty, kneeling at her faldstool, communicated under one kind, received the *pax* with apparent devotion; and so, in due course, the Sacrifice was ended, and the coronation service completed.

It had long been a custom for English monarchs

* *Vide* "Liber Regalis," pp. 33-35. Ed. London: 1870.

† Miss Strickland, in her "Life of Queen Elizabeth" (vol. vi. p. 168), remarks that the issue of the Bull of Pope Paul IV., dated 12th January 1558-9, "declaring heretical sovereigns incapable of reigning . . . did not deprive her of the allegiance of her Catholic peers, all of whom paid their liege homage to her," failed to note that as the coronation took place only three days after the time of its promulgation, the Bull could not possibly have reached England or become known to the peers in question.

‡ Opinions and accounts differ on this point, though testimony for the statement in the text predominates.

on the occasion of their coronation to release certain prisoners. Elizabeth, on the morning afterwards, making no exception to the rule, did the same, in the presence of her court. At the close of the proceedings, one of the courtiers, who had duly rehearsed the farce beforehand, came forward, with the accustomed genuflections and bows, and in a loud voice, but keeping his countenance effectually, implored the Queen that four or five more prisoners might be graciously released. Her Majesty inquired their names.

“Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the four Evangelists, and the Apostle Paul,” was the immediate retort. “These men, most dread sovereign, have been, as it were, so closely shut up in the prison of an unknown tongue, that until released they cannot converse with the Lord’s people.”

As Bacon has recorded, the Queen answered gravely, “It is first best to inquire of them whether they themselves approve of being released or not.”

This incident was spoken of in public and commented on by the preachers from the Continent.

On the 13th January 1558–1559, five new peers were created, viz. William Parr, a Lancashire nobleman, restored to his title of Marquis of Northampton; Edward Seymour, made

Earl of Hertford; Thomas Howard, son of the late Duke of Norfolk, made Viscount Howard of Bindon in Dorsetshire; Sir Oliver St. John, made Lord St. John of Bletsoe; and the Lady Mary Boleyn's son, Sir Henry Carey, created Baron Hunsdon. All these belonged to the innovating, or, as some term it, the "Reforming" party. The Court, under Cecil's advice, resolved at the same time to influence the elections to the House of Commons, so five candidates were previously named for each of the counties and three for each of the boroughs, from amongst whom the members were chosen.

Ten days after the coronation the Houses of Parliament met. The first act taken by the Commons was to vote and present a "humble but earnest Address to the Queen, that she would vouchsafe to accept some match capable of supplying heirs to her Majesty's royal virtues and dominions." The Queen, who evidently did not like interference on such a subject, told the Speaker and other members that she might long ago have married if she had so willed, but that for herself she should be heartily content to have it inscribed on her tomb after death that she had lived and died a virgin queen. She added, for their future guidance, amongst some involved sentences of studied ambiguity, that it was obviously neither their duty to prescribe to nor to bind her, but to

petition, if they so willed, and then humbly to obey.

Other important work followed. Thus :—

Queen Mary, King Henry's lawful daughter by his Queen the Lady Katherine, and Elizabeth the illegitimate daughter of the King by Anne Boleyn, had both been expressly declared illegitimate by statute under Henry VIII.* When Mary succeeded to the throne, however, an Act had been at once passed† declaring that she had been born "in a most just and lawful matrimony," and thus the unstained honour of her mother was dutifully and properly vindicated. Elizabeth at the present time, who, of course, stood on another platform, acted in quite a different manner: possibly under the influence of her advisers, who saw the complex and complicated difficulties before them, and who in the new Act passed were consequently vague and ambiguous in the language they selected. This Act at once claimed for Elizabeth regular and due royal descent, and at the same time conferred upon her the right to reign by the authority of Parliament; two features obviously inconsistent and self-destructive.

In due course, after some discussion, but at no

* 28 Henry VIII. c. 7.

† 1 Mary, Session ii. c. 1.

long interval after assembling, the two Houses passed some most momentous laws, the full force and importance of which upon the National Church are even now scarcely realized.

By these new laws what was not over-exactly termed the "ancient jurisdiction of the Crown over the estate ecclesiastical and spiritual," was said to be "restored," and all "foreign jurisdiction repugnant to the same" abolished. By this Act, the general repeal under Queen Mary of the "reforming" statutes of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. was directly abrogated: all spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction of every sort and kind, without any exception, being thus vested in the Crown, though now worn by a woman, in virtue of which enactment special Royal Commissions, composed of clerks and laymen, were at once appointed, their powers from time to time renewed and extended; while the "Court of High Commission," as it was termed, was subsequently established on the same parliamentary authority in 1583.

Furthermore, and at once, all ministers and officers whatsoever, whether temporal or spiritual, whether bishops or judges, canons or magistrates, parish clerks or pikemen, were bound to take an oath acknowledging the Queen to be "the only supreme governor of the realm as well in spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as

temporal"; * and renouncing "all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, or authorities," under pain of forfeiture of present office, and disability to hold any other.

It was further enjoined that the oath in question was to be formally and duly tendered to every such person throughout the realm within thirty days of the prorogation of Parliament at

* That this tradition, now all but exploded, has come down to the present time is abundantly evident from the following Protest of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, read, prior to the consecration of the Bishop of Durham (A.D. 1879), by the Dean in the Jerusalem Chamber:—

"I, the Very Reverend Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, Doctor in Divinity, Dean of the collegiate church of St. Peter, Westminster, *immediately subject to the Queen's Majesty and no other*, do hereby, on behalf of the Dean and Chapter of the said church, declare and protest that by compliance with licence of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury to the Lord Archbishop of York to consecrate the Rev. Joseph Barber Lightfoot, Doctor in Divinity, to be Bishop and Pastor of the cathedral church of Durham, we do not intend to acknowledge any jurisdiction or authority of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury over us, the said Dean and Chapter, or over our said collegiate church; *but do claim and assert that we are immediately subject to the Queen's Majesty and no other ecclesiastical authority whatsoever*; and that we have granted the use of our said collegiate church to the Lord Archbishop of York for the said consecration, in pursuance of the mandate of Her Majesty the Queen, dated at Westminster, the 29th day of March last, in the forty-second year of Her Majesty's reign.

"Dated the 25th day of April, 1879.

"(Signed)

ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY."

the end of its session.* All persons about to take Orders, or to receive degrees in the universities, all clergymen about to be promoted to any spiritual livings, or already in possession of benefices, as well as all laymen in office, such as judges, magistrates, or persons receiving wages of the Crown, or suing out livery of their lands, were to take the oath. It was specially enacted, moreover, as a leading and crucial principle, that the authority needful for the visitation of all spiritual persons, and the correction of errors, heresies, and abuses, should be annexed to the Crown; and that the power of exercising this authority by delegates to be appointed by Letters Patent under the Great Seal should remain with the Queen and her successors for ever.

Against this revolutionary and ridiculous act John Feckenham, Abbot of Westminster, made a powerfully argumentative and even brilliant speech in the House of Lords, in which he thus dwelt on the deeds of disorder, disobedience, and destruction then being perpetrated:—

“ In her late Majesty’s reign, your Lordships may remember how quiet and governable the

* In this enactment Temporal Peers were excepted by a special clause; just as in recent times the English bishops succeeded in getting the Public Worship Regulation Act passed for the clergy generally, while they duly and carefully secured themselves from either or any of its operations.

people were. It was not then their custom to prescribe to Authority, to run before the laws, nor disobey the proclamations of their sovereign. There was then no sacrilegious rapine, no plundering of churches, no blasphemous outrage and trampling the holy sacraments under their feet. It was none of their way to tear down the pix, and hang up the knave of clubs in its place. They did not hack and hew the crucifix in those times. They were better observers of discipline than to eat flesh openly, and fill their shambles with butchers' meat in the holy solemnity of Lent. In the late reign the generality of the people, and particularly the nobility and those of the Privy Council, were exemplary for their public devotion: it being the custom to go to a church or chapel, to beg the protection of God, before they entered upon the business of the day. But now the face of things is quite otherwise."*

This Supremacy in things spiritual, as the whole tenor of the new Act most clearly shows, was not held to be inherent in the Crown—such an idea would have been absurd—but was regarded as a special grant,† expressly made by

* Abbot Feckenham's speech against the Act of Uniformity. —"Bib. Cott. Vesp. D.," xviii. fol. 8, *et seq.*

† No person can give or grant that which he himself does not possess or own. So was it in the case of Elizabeth's Parliament.

the power and authority of Parliament. Here, then, was a portentous and complete revolution.

Those, therefore, who should be found to maintain, "by express words, deed, or act," the authority of any foreign prince or prelate, were, by this new enactment, to forfeit their goods; or, if these did not amount to the value of £20, such persons were, for the first offence, to be put into prison for twelve months; to incur the penalties of *præmunire* for the second; and to be regarded as guilty of high treason, and to be put to death as traitors—*i.e.* drawn, hung, dismembered, disembowelled, beheaded, and quartered—for the third.

This Act, be it noted, directly revived all the most obnoxious and atrocious of the enactments of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., as has been already pointed out. The substitution, however, of the term "Supreme Governor"* for "Supreme Head" of the English Establishment † was a

* Calvin in his "Commentary on the Book of Amos" (ch. vii. v. 13) had written thus:—"Erant enim blasphemi qui vocarent eum (Henricum VIII.) Summum Caput Ecclesiæ sub Christo"; so those Protestant theologians who valued this heresiarch's opinions had the craft and wisdom to change the term without changing the thing.

† No special provision was made in case the monarch became a Brownist, a Lutheran, or Presbyterian—an omission which might have caused difficulties in recent times, had not the "Supremacy of Public Opinion" been gradually allowed

mere distinction without a difference, as subsequent events too truly proved.

It must not be supposed that such a revolution was brought about without both expostulation and protest on the part of some. The whole of the Episcopate to a man voted against the third reading; and two bishops, on behalf of their brethren in spiritual authority, made efficient speeches against it. These were Archbishop Heath of York, and Bishop Scott of Chester.

The Archbishop most forcibly pointed out that, as the Queen's sovereignty descended by hereditary right, the grant of such special supremacy in spiritual matters was quite beyond the power of Parliament to bestow, and altogether so great a novelty, and unprecedented, as to be both dangerous and wrong. His Grace further maintained that all women, of what sort soever they might be, were entirely unqualified for spiritual functions. They could neither preach nor ad-

to take the place of the Tudor supremacy, which, as all except the modern Erastians admit, has long lost both its moral and political value and importance. Originally introduced by the halter and irons, it is now bereft of its power and has completely collapsed. The "Supremacy of Public Opinion," however, as administered and enforced in Parliamentary law courts, has efficiently taken its place; and of course will remain in power in the State Establishment so long as it is the will of the majority of the electors that a State Establishment shall be maintained.

minister the sacraments nor exercise spiritual censures—acts which belonged exclusively to the clergy and the hierarchy.

Bishop Scott of Chester then argued that without a chief pastor the visible Church would be weakened. Such a guide was practically necessary for receiving appeals from and determining controversies within the boundaries of all local or national churches. Taking notice that the Pope's authority had been disclaimed by an English provincial council, he announced that the resolutions of such an assembly were of no force whatsoever against the decrees of the Universal Church.*

* As a recent author has so forcibly and ably written:—
“When England embraced the Christian faith, she became a part of Christ's spiritual Kingdom or Empire. She did not become the whole of that Kingdom. It was an absolute impossibility for her to do so. Until therefore one part of anything can be equal to the thing itself, so long is it impossible that a part of Christ's Kingdom can be His whole Kingdom. In other words, England is not an Empire, speaking spiritually. And if England is not a spiritual Empire, but one mere Province of a spiritual Empire, then appeals cannot have their final determination without the assent and consent of the other Provinces of the universal Kingdom. If such a thing were possible then might one Province claim to decide a spiritual question in one way, and another Province in another way. Thus direct conflict would arise. There would be instead of One spiritual Kingdom or Empire of Christ, as many spiritual Kingdoms as there are Christian nations in the world, all absolutely independent one of another, and every one possibly divided

England, he maintained, was only one part of Christ's universal kingdom; and, furthermore, that no man nor body of men can bestow that which they themselves do not already possess. These speeches were carefully heard and warmly applauded.

About this period a document of "Questions and Advices," drawn up, no doubt, by Sir Thomas Smith, one of King Edward's advisers, was submitted to Cecil, as a guide in the work of so-called "Reformation." A new service-book was at once needed, and the Queen by Letters Patent appointed Drs. Bill, Parker, Cocks, and May, together with Mr. Grindal, Mr. Whitehead, and Mr. Pilkington, to prepare it. The lawful Bishops of the Church of England were in this work

against every other, and fighting against every other. And thus the Catholic Church would have long since been brought to desolation, and have had an end. This was not the way, beloved, that the Divine Wisdom built His House, and hewed out His Seven mystic pillars. It is the Statute of Appeals, and the assertion that England is, spiritually speaking, an Empire, and that the Church of England as a part is equal to the whole; and that this part of the one Kingdom of Christ is competent to decide spiritual questions apart from the other Provinces of Christ's Kingdom and independently of them; in other words, without the consent of the rest of Christendom, which is in direct and irreconcilable antagonism to the revealed word of God, and a bold and daring contradiction to the express will of the Incarnate Son of God."—"The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," by the Rev. T. W. Mossman, O.C.R., p. 8. London: 1879.

wholly ignored in favour of men owning no spiritual authority whatsoever, and deeply tainted with dangerous heresies. Cecil, desiring moderation and comprehensiveness, gave these persons very express orders both what to do and what to avoid.* The Lord Keeper Bacon, in his speech at the opening of Parliament, pointed out that "nothing should be advised or done which anyway in continuance of time was likely to breed or nourish any kind of idolatry or superstition." In these particulars his lordship's timely and valuable advice was certainly not ignored.

With a few trifling alterations, what is known as the "Second Prayer Book of Edward VI."† was now, by the Act of Uniformity, restored to use, having been thus recommended. That devotional volume was the baldest and barest that could have been compiled. Its scrappy service for the

* A frightful passage from the Litany, which harmonized well enough with the maniacal notion of most of the "Reformers," that the Bishop of the See of St. Peter is "*the Antichrist*"—"From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities"—was, at Cecil's suggestion, but after considerable opposition, omitted.

† On July 19, 1559, a Commission was issued by the Queen, constituting Parker, Archbishop-elect of Canterbury, Grindal, Bishop-elect of London, and others, Commissioners for carrying into execution the Acts for the uniformity of Common Prayer, and for restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction of the State ecclesiastical.—"Domestic Papers, Elizabeth," vol. v. No. 18.

Holy Communion, into which the Ten Commandments had been introduced,* for the sake of the second (believed by the narrow-minded fanatics who had first compiled the new production to be a protest against what has been in recent times called "Eucharistic Adoration" †), was supposed to have been founded on an English version of the Sarum Mass; hacked about and mutilated, however, in every portion. All the old Introits, many of the Proper Prefaces, all the Secret Prayers, and Collects after Communion, were abolished by a few

* A long and wearisome dissertation by Pollanus, delivered at Strasburg, pointing out how the Second Commandment forbids the worship of the Host, and how desirable it is that this "Law of God" should be kept before the eyes of the populace, was no doubt the origin of the introduction of the Ten Commandments both into the Liturgy and on to the east wall of our English churches.

† The doctrine of the Reformers concerning what they called "the Lord's Supper," was truly and faithfully taught by the late Mr. John Keble, in his well-known un-revised verse in "The Christian Year":—

"O come to our Communion Feast:
There present in the heart,
Not in the hands, th' eternal Priest
Will His true self impart."

"The minister gives what is in his power, namely, the Bread and Wine, and *not the Body of Christ*; nor is it exhibited by the minister and eaten by the communicant, otherwise than in the word preached, read, or meditated upon. And to eat the Body of Christ is nothing more than to believe, as He Himself teaches in the sixth (chapter) of John."—Letter of Hooper to Bucer, "Original Letters," p. 47. Parker Society's Works.

rude strokes of the pen. Those sacred parts of the ancient Canon not cast aside as idolatrous, or rejected because the venerated saints of Christendom were thereby had in memory, were mistranslated, detached from their contexts, broken up, interpolated with novel phrases of ambiguous meaning, separated either from other, and without an ancient parallel formed into a new service which remains as a monument of the deliberate craft, skilful double-dealing,* and heretical tendencies of those who compiled it.

At what is known as the "Consecration Prayer," no directions whatsoever were given to the presiding minister for blessing the bread and wine, or for touching either of those elements while the prayer was being said—a crucial omission. For Church ministers to have done so from the time of Elizabeth to the period of revision under Charles II. would have been to have broken the statute law of the land. It is open to ques-

* The saying that "the Church of England owns an Arminian Prayer Book and Calvinistic Articles," though perhaps strictly inexact, is a testimony to the intentional vagueness and studied ambiguity of those formularies. At the present day none of her authorities can declare what she teaches even with regard to Baptism. All "views" (as they are called) are tolerated, from the doctrine of Catholics to the heresy of Calvinists. Anything and everything is allowed, little is forbidden, but nothing definite or precise is authoritatively and universally taught.

tion, therefore, if, notwithstanding the profound special pleading of several modern writers in its favour, such a form for celebrating the Holy Eucharist in use for exactly a hundred years, could have been valid. If there be intentionally no act of blessing, of course no benediction is given. If there be no express deed of consecration (as both Common Sense and Theology declare) no consecration is by consequence effected.

The well-known "rule of contraries" was duly applied by those who made these changes. For example, in the Mass there was always an altar of stone used: in the new Service of the Supper a table of wood. At the former the priest was enjoined to stand before the altar: at the latter, by way of contrast, the minister was directed to go to the north end of the table. In the Mass the priest invariably began the service on the Epistle side, and the *Gloria in excelsis* was said or sung at its commencement: in the Supper the minister began on the Gospel side, while in this new service the *Gloria in excelsis* was placed at its close.

Moreover, the mixed chalice, the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the sign of the cross, were all omitted: at the delivery of the bread and wine, instead of the old form, the offensive words "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ

died for thee,” &c.,* were substituted. A table consisting of a pair of rude trestles and a horizontal wooden board,† now took the place of the

* In the Mass, as the words spoken on giving Communion indicated, the Body and Blood of Christ were bestowed; whereas, in the Supper, the minister distributed “Bread and Wine” to a seated congregation in remembrance of our Saviour’s death upon Calvary. No greater contrast, than that so manifest between the new and the old, could be conceived.

As Jewell, a bishop and an authority, thus wrote:—“Spiritually and with the mouth of our faith we eat the Body of Christ and drink His Blood. . . . The Bread that we receive with our bodily mouths is an earthly thing, and therefore a figure, as the water in baptism is likewise a figure.”—“John Jewell, Bishop of Sarum, in Controversy with Harding,” p. 448.

And Bishop Grindal—“Whoso will be relieved by the Body of Christ must receive Him as He will be received, with the instrument of faith appointed thereunto, not with his teeth or mouth.”—Grindal’s “Remains,” p. 46.

† “Twain trestlys and a boord of joyner’s work for the Supper.”—Churchwardens’ Accounts, A.D. 1559, for St. Mary’s, Ipswich.

“*Item* (paid) to John ye carpenter for ye mackying of treystles for ye Communyon, iijs. 4d.”—Church Book, Thame, Oxon, A.D. 1560.

Mr. J. H. Parker, C.B. (A.D. 1879) thus kindly writes to me:—“Some thirty years ago a friend of mine, who was a brother archæologist, published a pamphlet to explain that all the Communion Tables of the time of Elizabeth and James I. had the table itself—that is, the wooden slab, *tabula*, or board—detached from the framework, on which it is placed, but many of them still remained undetached. He printed a list of these, and I verified many of them. Others had been attached to the framework in quite recent times with modern iron screws. In some cases, instead of a framework, tressels were used, and this, I believe, is still the case in the Isle of Jersey, at least when I was there. The table, or wooden slab, was brought

ancient consecrated stone altar. Sometimes it was placed in the middle of the choir, and occasionally in the nave. Cross and candlesticks were swept away. Instead of the old "massing cups," the "chalices of Antichrist," "cups of the sorceress," as they were profanely called,—most of which had disappeared,* having been too affectionately grasped and retained by the Edwardian "Reformers" and their energetic agents,—newly made domestic and secular-looking vessels for the Communion table, of quite a different shape, with covers, seem to have been almost universally adopted. Thus a Supper of bread and wine, given once a quarter at mid-day, in remembrance of an act done long ago, Christ's death, was once again intentionally substituted for the adorable sacrifice of the Christian dispensation, enjoined by our Divine Master to be offered continually—

out of the chancel and placed in the nave on tressels by the side of the reading-desk for the Communion Service. I was told this was always the case in that island."

* It seems very doubtful if so many as twenty old English chalices and patens remain throughout the whole of the two provinces. I know of old examples at Trinity and Corpus Christi Colleges, Oxford; Wymondham, Norfolk; Nettlecombe and Pilton, Somersetshire; Brancaster, Norfolk; West Drayton, Middlesex; St. Sampson's, Guernsey; Great Waltham, Essex; Combe Pyne, Devonshire; Cliffe, Kent; Walmer, Kent; Leominster, Herefordshire; Shernbourne, Norfolk; and a few in private keeping. The Rev. E. J. Phipps owned a good specimen.

a sacrifice true, proper, and propitiatory, as well for the departed as for the living.

Furthermore in our Baptismal Service the exorcisms, the unction, the trine immersion, and the putting on of the chrisom-cloth were all omitted. The Service for Confirmation* was so altered and disfigured, both in its form and matter (for here likewise the use of unction and the sign of the cross were dropped), that many doubt whether it is valid; it being thus reduced to a mere episcopal blessing which might be again and again repeated without any danger of sacrilege. In the Service for the Visitation of the Sick all mention of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction was cast out; and reservation of the Holy Eucharist omitted. In the Burial of the Dead, all the touching and beautiful prayers for the departed were dropped, and the Eucharist at funerals disallowed. Neither alb, vestment, nor cope was henceforth to be used; but only a surplice for a priest or deacon, and a rochet for a bishop.

The solemn and expressive services for Holy Week; the various episcopal rites peculiar to Maundy Thursday and Easter Even; the special

* See a short, but learned and vigorous, article on this subject—"Confirmation in the Church of England"—on p. 271 *et seq.* of "The Reunion Magazine," vol. i. London: Nutt. 1879.

hallowing and beneficent solemnities of Good Friday; as for example, the consecration of the holy oils, the service of the Præ-sanctified, the Creeping to the Cross, the benediction of new fire, of the Paschal taper and of the font,—ancient and hallowed rites which so efficiently taught people through the eye,—were all swept away: so that, in our own day, as a consequence of such changes, the Christian feasts having, many of them, been long disused, Parliament has thought it desirable and necessary to appoint four secular days of recreation; while Good Friday, the death-day of the world's Redeemer, has been practically made a festival; and Ascension Day, a feast of obligation, has been almost entirely forgotten.*

The magnificent and appropriate services common to days on which prelates, martyrs, confessors, virgins, and holy women, had been for centuries commemorated, were totally and completely abolished. Portuaries, Manuals, Missals of the various national rites, Books of the Hours of Our Lady, the Offices for the Dead, Pontificals, Ceremonials, Antiphonals and jewelled Books of the Gospels, were each and all utterly

* As the Church of England in its corporate capacity takes little heed of this loss, and its authorities adopt no measures to restore the due observance of the day, a new and special Society has been set up to compass and effect this object, so much required, and so excellent in itself.

cast out and burnt—save, of course, the acceptable gold and jewels which adorned them. Severe punishment followed even the possession of such volumes. A restless desire for change combined with a repulsive fanaticism, thus led those who in the struggle had now secured the whip-handle of usurped Power, to destroy and sweep away whatever seemed to be at variance with their newly-formed tastes, or personal ambition.

In the early part of the month of May, a bill for annexing to the Crown all abbeys, priories, nunneries, chantries, and hospitals, passed through both Houses of Parliament. In the Upper House every one of the Lords Spiritual voted against it, and when passed, dissented from it by a formal act. It will thus be seen that the legal spiritual authorities of the Church of England, as bound by oath and office, declined, as by every principle of morality they were bound, to take any part in this fresh act of sacrilege and robbery.

While Parliament sat considering the new propositions, the clergy as of old were assembled in Convocation. To these the Queen sent a somewhat arrogant message of warning, indicating with sufficient clearness to those who had already watched the course of recent events, what her royal will, as Supreme Governess of the Established Church, was, in reference to those propositions. On being informed of the opposition of

all the prelates,* she had stamped her foot violently and sworn her usual expressive oath. But the fearless bishops, nobly and bravely doing their duty as guardians of the Faith and their flocks,—neither hirelings, wolves, nor robbers, come into the fold “some other way,”—drew up a Profession of Faith and presented it to the House of Lords,† asserting, firstly, the true and undoubted doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice and the Real Presence, in opposition to a sentimental pre-

* Bishop Tunstall wrote to Cecil from London on Aug. 19, 1559, who declared that he could not consent to the visitation of his diocese, if it extended to the pulling down of altars, the defacing of churches, and the taking away crucifixes.—“State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth,” vol. vi. p. 137.

† The chief points of their profession stand thus:—

“Primò, quod in sacramento altaris, virtute verbi Christi à sacerdote debitè prolati existentis, præsens est realitèr, sub speciebus panis et vini, naturale Corpus Christi, conceptum de Virgine Maria; item naturalis ejus sanguis.

“Item, quod, post consecrationem, non remanet substantia panis et vini, neque ulla alia substantia, nisi substantia Dei et hominis.

“Item, quod in missa offertur verum Christi Corpus, et verus ejusdem sanguis, sacrificium propitiatorium pro vivis et defunctis.

“Item, quod Petro apostolo, et ejus legitimis successoribus in Sede apostolica, tanquam Christi vicariis, data est suprema potestas pascendi et regendi Ecclesiam Christum militantem, et fratres suos confirmandi.

“Item, quod authoritas tractandi et definiendi de iis, quæ spectant ad fidem, sacramenta, et disciplinam ecclesiasticam, hactenus semper spectavit, et spectare debet, tantum ad pastores Ecclesiæ, quos Spiritus Sanctus ad hoc in Ecclesiâ Dei posuit, et non ad laicos.”—Wilkins’ “Concilia,” vol. iv. p. 179.

sence in the heart or mind of the receiver, which the innovators maintained; secondly, the lawful and generally-recognized power and privileges of the Holy See; and, thirdly, the exclusive right of the spiritual rulers of the Church Universal, and not of the laity or a lay assembly, to define and declare and decide upon, its doctrine and discipline.

In consequence of this, and as one mode of blunting the power and destroying the influence of the Bishops, a disputation was appointed to be held in Westminster Abbey on March 31st, by which clever expedient the critical spirit of the period was fostered, public attention aroused, and time for more consideration of the grave circumstances which had arisen efficiently secured. The Lord Keeper Bacon, representing the Supreme Governness, presided, and the sittings of the Houses of Parliament were suspended, in order that idle, curious, or interested members might attend and witness the exciting dialectical contest. Numerous languid loungers,* accustomed to the fashionable delights of the rat-pit and bear-baiting, gathered for the anticipated entertainment. Protestant ballad-singers and buf-

* Thomas Cecil wrote to his father, Sir William, on July 25, 1561, to say that he had been present at the Court at Paris at a fight between a lion and three dogs, in which the dogs were victorious.—“State Papers, Elizabeth, 1547-1580.”

foons, stationed near the west door of St. Margaret's Church, amused the lower classes by caricaturing religion. Various controversial subjects were discussed within the Abbey; *e.g.*, whether prayers in Latin were to be henceforth permitted; whether local churches have the right and power to set themselves up against the decisions and decrees of the whole Church of God; and whether the Eucharist be a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead. On the side of the ancient faith were Archbishop Heath, Bishops White, Bayne, Scott, and Watson; with Dr. Cole, Dean of St. Paul's; Dr. Nicholas Harpsfield, Archdeacon of Canterbury and Judge of the Court of Arches; and Dr. Langdale, Archdeacon of Lewes. On the side of the innovating party were Bishop Scory, Dr. Cocks, Mr. Horne, Mr. Aylmer, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Grindal, Mr. Ghest, and Mr. Jewell. The prelates in rochets and violet mantles assembled in the choir, where a long and narrow table down its pathway had been placed for their use, and were seated on the Gospel side. The other party, in gowns, putting their trust in the Queen's delegate, and on the look-out for some of the good things of this world,* took their places on the

* Edmund Ghest, on August 31, 1559, wrote to inform Cecil that "Mr. Seth Holland will not renounce the Pope," and then solicits that he (Ghest) may succeed him in the deanery.—"Domestic Papers, Elizabeth," vol. vi. p. 137.

south. The monks' stalls were filled with peers and others interested in the dispute. A gathering of exiled preachers and foreign divines in black cassocks and stiff white ruffs, armed with large tomes, from which to prompt and aid their friends, were grouped near the choir doors. The public, wherever a sight and hearing could be had, assembled in numbers. The whole dispute, conducted with singular one-sidedness, but anxiously listened to, was so unfair to the legal representatives of the Ancient Church, that the Catholic party, perceiving this, after vain remonstrances, and being wholly in the hands of Bacon who presided, wisely and resolutely retired on the second day. Upon this Bishops White and Watson were at once, without notice, process, or trial, committed to prison in the Tower—a gross piece of high-handed tyranny.* Nothing, of course, could have been more effective in overcoming the force of their telling arguments, or in preventing their incisive logic and solemn appeals from having reasonable and just weight with the listeners. It was asserted in justification that they were thus punished for disobedience to the Queen's delegate,

* Some writers assert that these two bishops' true offence was that they had already privately and solemnly threatened the Queen with excommunication if she continued to intrude in matters inherently and essentially spiritual.

who sat and acted in her Most Sacred Highness's place, and who had enjoined them to proceed and not to retire; but the real object of this bold action was to overawe others and overbear all legitimate opposition to the proposed Parliamentary legislation.

The Bill enjoining the New Prayer Book soon afterwards became law, it having been carried in the Upper House by a narrow majority of three in a large assembly—a tolerably clear indication of the feeling against innovation and change which existed, and proving that such an act of tyranny as that just recorded was absolutely essential for the success of the innovators.

The Act of Uniformity enjoining the use of the revised Service Book, indirectly decreed that on and after the Feast of St. John the Baptist, 1559, any one who said mass according to those rites of the Church of England which had been followed essentially for nearly a thousand years, as well as any and every one who heard mass, or administered baptism or any of the sacraments according to the old directions and services, or who used any but the new, should, for the first offence, be fined one hundred marks; for the second, four hundred marks; and if these respective fines were not promptly paid, imprisonment for twelve months followed; with imprisonment for life and the forfeiture of all goods and chattels if a third

offence were proved. Jewell, though a severe and sour writer of bad theology, sometimes became witty, and occasionally postured as a buffoon; as for instance when he wrote to Peter Martyr, some months later, telling him the welcome news that the Catholics had no right to complain of the Queen, for that mass had never before been so highly valued or expensive as then; for, by God's Gospel, it cost every spectator of it no less than two hundred crowns.

On the day appointed, therefore, the public celebration of mass ceased. Those who elected to range themselves in opposition to the innovators soon found what was involved in such a choice.* As the records of this reign are examined, step by step, and the harrowing tale of persecution is told, it will be seen with what a high hand those carried affairs who by the use of Might over Right had secured influence, authority, and power. All the varied "beggars-on-horseback" rode a rapid race to their due and proper goal.

But we must proceed step by step, and with

* On June 30, 1559, the Marquis of Winchester wrote to Cecil to inform him that the Dean and Canons of Winchester Cathedral, the Warden and Fellows of New College, and the Master of St. Cross' Hospital "left their services, and will enter no new service, being against their consciences."

due care, to state exactly only that which can be surely and conclusively proved to be true.

With the single exception of Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, who had been consecrated by Cranmer on May 3, 1545, without approval by, or authorization from, Rome, the whole body of bishops, one and all, firmly resolved to decline assent to this new legislation. Involving as it did both a fresh separation from the Chief Bishop of Christendom, whose saintly predecessor, Pope St. Gregory the Great, had sent St. Augustine to become a light to our country; and being likely as they believed, to augment all the complex evils of new and needless divisions, they declined to be participators in that which was wrong. In their noble opposition—being unable to render to a woman, a female Cæsar, the things of God—they were firm and determined. They could not in conscience maintain that the Queen was the Supreme Governor or Governess of the Church under Christ; and, therefore, repudiated the action and legislation of the civil authority, as beyond its due and proper powers, and by the law of God altogether illegal.

Amongst these are several names of men of high virtue and repute, names which because of their action at the crisis in question, merit to be had in everlasting remembrance. The first is that of Nicholas Heath. He had been conse-

crated Bishop of Rochester by Bonner of London, and others, in the chapel of London House, in the spring of 1540. Translated three years afterwards by Henry VIII. to the see of Worcester, he was thrown into prison and treated with great harshness under Edward VI.; but on Queen Mary's accession, confessing his previous failings, and the aid he had given to the innovators, he was reconciled to the Church and made Archbishop of York and Lord High Chancellor. In his Province he laboured assiduously, and was venerated and respected both by high and low.

Edmund Bonner was another. A Worcestershire and Oxford man, he had for some years been one of Henry VIII.'s courtly chaplains, and had certainly made himself notorious enough by his mistaken zeal in promoting that King's divorce. When in Rome, in so doing (as he himself admits), he had behaved with great personal rudeness and insolence to the Pope. At home he had gone a considerable way on the "Reforming" road, and had even accepted many of the violent changes under Edward VI.; but the fanaticism, heresy, and blasphemies then in favour at Court—working on all sides so many evils—were more than he could approve of or adopt. So the civil authorities deprived him of his see, which was given to Nicholas Ridley; and Bonner likewise was cast into prison. Under Queen

Mary, having been duly restored to his former episcopal seat, he did a great work in stemming the tide of irreligious revolution; in restraining misbelievers; and in building anew the waste and desolate places of his important diocese. He was certainly unpopular with some; his acts in administering a harsh and cruel law have been considerably misrepresented; and his name has been cast out as evil by certain historical romancers or one-sided partizans; but when after experiencing the evils of innovation, a man of resolute and settled principles, owning authority, acts with decision and boldness on the side of Truth, he must expect opposition, and scorn the unjust condemnation of petty and misinformed scribes, too often the trumpeters and apologists of Error and Falsehood.

Cuthbert Tonstall, Bishop of Durham, old and afflicted, and Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Ely, were committed to the care of Matthew Parker, the Queen's new Archbishop, and his lady, at Lambeth Palace. The former, Tonstall, soon died, some said of a broken heart, in November of the same year, and was buried in the parish church; * the latter lived through eleven stirring

* "November (1570). The xxix day Cuthbret Tunstall a popish bishop was buryed."—MS. List of Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials at St. Mary's, Lambeth.

years, and witnessed more changes and greater violence, passing to his rest in August of the year 1570.

John White, born at Farnham in Surrey, was educated at Winchester and New College, of which latter he was made a fellow in 1527. Successively Head Master and Warden of Winchester, he was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln by Bonner and others at St. Saviour's, Southwark, on April 1st, 1554; two years afterwards he was translated to Winchester, where his reputation for sweetness of disposition and sanctity was great. He preached the funeral sermon of Queen Mary, and was so affected at the loss which Her Majesty's death had occasioned,* that for some time he stood in the pulpit, overwhelmed with sincere grief and speechless.

Even as these resisted, so did others. James Turberville, Bishop of Exeter, so consecrated on the Feast of the Nativity of Our Lady in 1555, was faithful and true even unto death. Gilbert Browne, sometime Archdeacon of London, but subsequently Bishop of Bath and Wells, deprived by Queen Elizabeth for disallowing her spiritual supremacy, was then consigned to the custody of

* He "fell into such an unfeigned weeping that for a long space he could not speak."—"Brief View," &c. by Sir John Harington.

Gregory Dodds,* Dean of Exeter, and so died in 1569. David Pole, sometime Dean of Arches Court, and subsequently Bishop of Peterborough, was deprived, because he likewise similarly resisted, and departed this life in June 1568. Ralph Baynes, a Yorkshireman and a great Hebrew scholar, consecrated Bishop of Litchfield in 1554, was deprived in June 1559, and died five months afterwards. Queen Elizabeth sent Cuthbert Scott, Bishop of Chester, having first deprived him, to the Fleet Prison, but he soon afterwards escaped, and died most devoutly at Louvain. Owen Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle, was also deprived in 1559,—on the last day of which momentous year he slept his last sleep in peace. Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln,† was likewise turned out of his bishopric at the same time, as were also Thomas Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph, and John Feckenham, Benedictine Abbot of Westminster. Of these three, the first and the last were carefully imprisoned, first in the Marshalsea, and subsequently in the dungeons

* Some writers give another name to this dean who had the custody of this Bishop of Bath.

† For a most interesting account of Bishop Watson, the reader should consult "Sermons on the Sacraments" by that prelate, edited by the Rev. T. E. Bridgett, who has prefixed thereto an admirable "Biographical Notice" of the Bishop, and has edited the book with conspicuous care and ability. London: Burns and Oates, 1876.

of Wisbeach Castle, situated in the flat and unhealthy fen country of the east, and after much suffering died there in 1585 ; Goldwell escaped to the city of Rome, living there for more than a quarter of a century in great sanctity and full of years, when he too slept sweetly in Christ. Richard Pate, sometime Bishop of Worcester, who had been officially present at the Council of Trent in 1552, happily escaped to the Continent and there died in peace.

On the 9th of September 1559, Letters Patent were issued appointing a Royal Commission to confirm the election of Matthew Parker, who had been irregularly elected by a minority of the Chapter of Canterbury on the 1st of August, and to give him episcopal consecration. At this time, ten of the English sees were vacant by death ; for many of the bishops had been thus called away from a scene of much anxiety and trouble, by a strange and fatal malady, some called it " the Plague," which wrought great havoc amongst all classes. Shortly afterwards, fifteen other bishops either resigned voluntarily, on marking what additional changes were about to take place ; or were formally deprived by certain Royal Commissioners, to whom, for this purpose, Her Majesty had duly delegated that supreme spiritual authority which had been vested in her by Parliament.

The Letters Patent concerning Parker's promotion had been addressed to Tonstall, Bishop of Durham, to Bourne, Bishop of Bath, to Poole, Bishop of Peterborough, to Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, all occupying sees, and to William Barlow and John Scory, bishops without sees. By an unusual inadvertence, however, no clause enabling a bare majority, or a certain number without the rest, to act, was inserted in the document. So that if any individual, or more, declined the honour, the work of the Royal Commissioners could not be carried out. This Commission, therefore, remained unfulfilled, to the great vexation of the Queen and to the deep annoyance of Sir William Cecil, who found himself in a considerable difficulty.

For, as it soon turned out, none of the prelates occupying the old sees, and possessing due and recognized canonical jurisdiction, could by any means be induced to act. Neither public arguments nor private threats could move them from their resolution of abstention from participating in any way in what they believed to be the irregular and uncanonical act resolved on.

Besides the prelates who thus stood aloof (all, in truth, except Anthony Kitchin), there were several suffragan bishops alive, whose orders were undoubted, but who were of course without jurisdiction, some of whom had gone into retire-

ment; others had received benefices and were still hale and strong, but much disinclined for further change. Amongst these were Thomas Sparke, Bishop of Berwick, who lived until 1571, and Robert Pursglove,* Bishop of Hull, who only died in 1579. William Finch, Bishop of Taunton, went to his rest in the very year in which Parker was consecrated. Of Thomas Morley, Bishop of Marlborough, John Bradley, Bishop of Shaftesbury, and Thomas Manning, Bishop of Ipswich, all most probably alive at Elizabeth's accession, there are no existing records known. None of these suffragans, however, were sought out.

In consequence, therefore, of the fiasco referred to, several learned clerks and canon lawyers, who either had a leaning to the Protestant party or were avowed members of it, viz. Doctors May, Weston, Leeds, Harvey, Yale, and Bullingham, were immediately consulted by Cecil, in order not only to suggest some remedy, but likewise to remove two very practical impediments to legal

* At Tideswell, in Derbyshire, where this bishop, Robert Pursglove was born, and educated under his uncle, William Bradshawe, Prior of Gisburne, in Yorkshire, he was also buried in 1575, and a memorial brass representing him in full pontifical vestments, with a series of verses in Latin and English, still remains. He was Bishop-Suffragan of Hull, Archdeacon of Nottingham and Provost of the College of Rotherham.—See "The Gentleman's Magazine," vol. lxiv. part 2, p. 1101. London: 1794.

security and actual success. For just then Cecil could not move. His existing letters and MSS. show that he was truly and completely puzzled.* These two leading practical difficulties stood thus : First, the law of the land unquestionably required the metropolitan and three provincials or at least four bishops holding sees, to confirm the election of a new Primate, but, as Cecil wrote, “ *There is no Archb. nor iiij bishoppes now to be had* ” ; and, secondly, the revised Ordinal, legalized under Edward VI.† had been formally and regularly abolished at the commencement of Queen Mary’s reign. “ *This booke is not established by Parliament,* ” continued the Secretary of State ; while the ancient Pontifical of Salisbury, used then once again, had in its turn been just formally set aside by Elizabeth. There was, therefore, no legal form for consecration in existence, or available at all. Here, then, was a grave dilemma.

The canon lawyers in question, however, came

* “ State Papers, Domestic, Queen Elizabeth,” vol. v., July, 1559. London : 1856.

† “ They have invented a new way to make bishops and priests and a manner of service and ministration that St. Augustine never knew, St. Edmund Lanfranc, St. Anselm, nor never one bishop of Canterbury, saving only Cranmer, who forsook his profession as *apostata* ; so that they must needs condemn all the bishops in Canterbury, but Cranmer and he that now is.”—“ The Addition concerning the Burning of St. Paul’s ” (a sixteenth-century fly-leaf).

to the conclusion that under the difficult and pressing circumstances—for necessity notoriously has no law—a new Commission might be issued to Anthony Kitchin of Llandaff and to certain unattached prelates, bishops without sees, authorizing them to confirm and consecrate* Matthew Parker. This advice was taken.

Accordingly on December 6th, 1559, a fresh Commission by Letters Patent was appointed and issued, addressed to the occupant of the see of Llandaff; to Barlow, sometime Bishop of Bath, a prelate of very fly-blown character; to Hodgkins, sometime Suffragan of Bedford; to Scory and Coverdale, bishops; to John Salisbury, Suffragan Bishop of Thetford, and to John Bale, Bishop, by Letters Patent, of Ossory in Ireland, a boisterous and alarming fanatic,—enjoining them, or any four of them, to proceed to the confirmation of the election, and so to the consecration of the Archbishop-elect.

Kitchin, the only bishop with a see, save Bale, the coarse and foul-mouthed Protestant from Ireland, when he thus found himself utterly isolated from the rest of his episcopal brethren, deliberately and firmly declined to act. Reasoning and

* It should be particularly noticed that this course of action would only touch the regularity, canonicity, and due legality of the consecration in question; not its validity.

threats were again both made use of, but to no avail. He would not and did not appear.

Accordingly Parker's election was confirmed on the 7th of September 1559; and he subsequently received episcopal consecration in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace on Sunday the 17th day of the same month and year, very early in the morning, at the hands of Barlow, Scory, Hodgkins, and Coverdale.*

* An able writer in the eighth volume of "The Union Review" for 1870, pp. 532-533, believed to be one of our leading historical critics, thus refers to this inauguration of the new rulers, and to some of those who took a leading official part in it:—"That the ceremony was gone through, admits of no more doubt than does the contempt of three at least of the four consecrators for the rite which they were called upon to perform. But it will be remembered that Scory has been accused of performing a jesting ceremony in imitation of a consecration at the Nag's Head Tavern, where the consecrators met on the day of the confirmation of the new Primate after the work of the morning was done, and dined together. It is certain that Scory was quite capable of going through a mock ceremony of consecration, and considering the character of the man, we think it is very likely he did. Neither of his colleagues would have been at all shocked at such a piece of profaneness; and probably Parker himself would have made light of it. Parker himself was at least externally a decent character, but we do not find that he at all shrunk from intercourse with such rascals as Barlow and Scory were. We have already alluded to Barlow, but Scory was the worst of the two. His course very much resembled Barlow's, with the additional scandal that he abjured his faith and dismissed his wife, and served under Bonner, in Queen Mary's reign. That he was chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer can add no infamy to Cranmer's name; but it must

As the records which chronicle this important act inform us, with unusual and almost unaccountable minuteness, the east end of the sanctuary on that occasion was hung with tapestry, and its floor laid with crimson cloth. In lieu of the abolished altar, a table had been placed at the east end, covered with a carpet, and having on it a cushion. To the north was set a seat for the Archbishop-elect; to the south faldstools for the consecrating bishops were arranged. These persons, as already pointed out, were Barlow, Hodgkins, Scory, and Coverdale. They came in long before it was light, accompanied by Parker, and preceded by four torchmen, by choir, chaplains, and legal officials. Edmund Grindal, Richard Cocks, and Edwin Sandys—all subsequently bishops—were also present, together with two registrars and two public notaries. Morning prayer was said by Pearson, a minister, and a sermon was preached by Scory; after which the Archbishop-elect and the other bishops went out to the vestry, prepared themselves for the actual consecration,

be admitted to be a blot on Ridley's fair fame, that he also made Scory his chaplain. When we have added to this, that he preached at the burning of Joan Bocher for heresy, and that amongst other Protestant notions held by him, he was notoriously opposed to the consecration of churches, we have said all that is necessary to secure him from being quoted with approbation by Anglican divines."

and again returned. Barlow took the chief part in the consecration, and with his attendants, Edmund Ghest, Archdeacon of Canterbury, and Nicholas Bullingham, Archdeacon of Lincoln, was vested in surplice and cope. Scory and Hodgkins appeared simply in surplices or rochets. Coverdale, who shunned what he termed such "heathen and Babylonish garments," appeared in something less ornate, a simple woollen gown. In the rite the new and bald Ordinal of 1549 seems to have been exactly followed (though it had been legally set aside under Queen Mary and never restored), save that, as the chief consecrator was not an archbishop, all the four bishops, when laying their hands upon Parker's head, *each* said, "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness." In these words there was no specification of the office to be conferred. There was no unction either, nor was there any delivery of a pastoral staff, though this last-named rite was formally and expressly enjoined in the service which was used.

Here, then, and in this manner, the new succession began ; * and some persons maintain that

* On the subject of the Nag's Head Fable, out of which uninformed controversialists have endeavoured to make capital,

its validity depended exclusively upon William Barlow. Hodgkins, however, had been certainly consecrated by John Stokesley, Bishop of London, and two others, as early as 1537, and Scory and Coverdale by Cranmer in 1551; so there is something of importance and consideration to be said in favour of the validity, though little for the canonical regularity, of this unprecedented official act.

The objection to Barlow that he was possibly unconsecrated, because the actual register of his consecration is wanting, seems unreasonable and groundless, for during more than twenty years he publicly and continually acted as a bishop, and specially took a chief part in the mortuary masses for the soul of Henry VIII.; and this in

Dr. Lingard wrote as follows:—"Of this tale concerning which so much has been written, *I can find no trace in any author or document of the reign of Elizabeth*. It is not improbable that the Commissioners, having confirmed the election, dined together at the Nag's Head, the inn chiefly frequented by the clergy at that period, and that this circumstance may have given rise to the story."—"History of England," by John Lingard, D.D., p. 380, vol. vii. London: 1838. "It may be admitted as proved," writes Canon Estcourt, in his learned, able, and temperate treatise entitled "The Question of Anglican Ordinations Discussed," "that *the Nag's Head story is a legend without foundation in fact*, and that the charge sometimes made of Parker and the first Elizabethan bishops assuming their place and discharging their functions without consecration of any kind is also unfounded."—p. 115. London: 1873.

the presence of other prelates who notoriously disliked change and dreaded innovation, and must have known well enough that, as regards his episcopal character, he was truly and actually what he was generally supposed to be.

This consecration having been effected, Parker in turn confirmed the election of Barlow to Chichester, and of Scory to Hereford ; and then with their aid soon afterwards, in due course, proceeded to consecrate the other persons who at the command of the Supreme Head had been elected to the various vacant bishoprics.

CHAPTER II.

PRIOR to the later events recorded in the last chapter, a proclamation had been issued in the spring of the year, of which Grindal, writing from London to Hubert the Reformer, about the end of May, thus gave his opinion :—

“ Now at last, by the blessing of God, during the prorogation of Parliament, there has been published a Proclamation to banish the Pope and his jurisdiction altogether, and to restore Religion to that form which we had in the time of Edward VI. If any bishops or any beneficed persons shall decline to take the oath of abjuration of the authority of the see of Rome, they are to be deprived of every ecclesiastical function and deposed. No one after the Feast of St. John the Baptist next ensuing may celebrate mass without subjecting himself to a most heavy penalty.” *

* Grindal to Conrad Hubert. “ Zurich Letters ” (Parker Society), vol. ii., No. 8.

This Proclamation produced immediate fruit. The innovators, who had been expecting it for some weeks, were, upon its receipt, at once prepared to act with boldness and determination. The carrying out of its decrees was, of course, left to local authorities. To such, considerable latitude was given. These authorities, beforehand and from headquarters, had been privately but duly instructed. There was to be an immediate raid on everything valuable in the churches, more especially on all ecclesiastical articles wrought in precious metal, and the Church lands were to be revalued, and possibly, as regards ownership, rearranged.* Those country gentlemen, therefore, who were at once doubtful on their own part of what to do, and doubted as to their zeal and competence by the agents of Cecil throughout the kingdom, were to be discreetly and confidentially sounded as to whether a share in the anticipated pickings and stealings might not probably quicken their interest and stir up their dormant energies to accomplish what the Council so earnestly desired should be immediately done.

In order to rouse public opinion, therefore, scurrilous publications from the pens of the re-

* An information made to Queen Elizabeth of the several abuses and frauds, &c., done unto the State, &c.—Harl. MSS. quoted in p. 124 of Weaver's "Funeral Monuments."

turned exiles, or foreign Protestants, had been simultaneously circulated by thousands. Some of these were gross in their language, filthy in their suggestions, revolutionary in their proposals, and though garnished with numerous texts of scripture, blasphemous in their teaching.* They appear to have been sent for distribution to all such laymen and apostate clergy as were known to be favourable to the tactics of the innovators. They were likewise freely distributed throughout the various Inns of Law, and especially amongst the students of Oxford and Cambridge. The authorized Commissioners for continuing and completing the changes resolved upon, found that the various parishes which had been selected for their special visitation had been duly prepared for their advent by the receipt, no one knew how or from what quarter, of the inflammatory and obscene literature in question.† The language applied therein to the Pope was frightful—far worse than

* In the 51st of the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth in 1559 this crying evil was seen and acknowledged thus:—“Because there is a great abuse in the Printers of Books, which from covetousness chiefly regard not what they print, so they may have gain, whereby ariseth the great disorder by publication of unfruitful, vain, and infamous books and papers,” &c.—“Sparrow’s Collections,” p. 80. London: 1671.

† The natural descendants of these unpleasant scribes may possibly be found amongst the modern Soupers of Connemara.

that which had recently been eliminated from the Litany—but it will be found more than equalled by the ribald trash and rancorous Letters and Homilies which have been reprinted and issued of late years in portly volumes by modern Puritans.* In the afore-mentioned literature, the sacraments were disparaged, the priesthood ridiculed, the act of ordination written of as “a magical incanting,” extreme unction styled “a corrupt following of the apostles” and the “dirty greasing of Antichrist”; while the Blessed Sacrament of the altar, hitherto reserved in a silver or golden pyx, was profanely called “Little Jack-in-the-box,” “John in captivity,” and treated with deliberate and artfully-designed indignities too fearful to describe.

All over the kingdom, in fact, wherever the innovators were sufficiently numerous, daring, and profane, this kind of controversial blasphemy was current, and often became fashionable and popular; while some of the deeds done—by no means unlike in character to that about to be recorded—are in truth too frightful for any detailed description of them to be put into words.

One record of such—with the swift punishments which followed—will for the present suffice. It

* Publications of the Parker Society.

has come down to us on good and sufficient authority—a priest of the Church of God—and affords, it is to be feared, too graphic and accurate a picture of similar dark deeds then perpetrated :—

“After that the Holy Mass was, by public Proclamation of the late Queen,* commanded to surcease immediately in all places of England by Midsummer Day immediately following, four men of Dover, in the county of Kent, besides others which assisted at the same action, went into the church of the same town and took forth the copes, vestments, and other priestly ornaments belonging thereto, giving forth and boasting abroad that they would go fetch the Pope from Canterbury; and the very next day after Midsummer Day, these companions came to Canterbury, put on the said copes, and other ornaments upon their backs, and in a pix, made to reserve the Blessed Sacrament of the Body of our Saviour Jesus, they put a dog’s [excrement]; and then beginning at St. George’s Gate, rode in form of procession quite through the city, till they came to Westgate; which done, the very same night they posted back again to Dover.

“One of these four was Captain Roberts, who

* The book was not published until the reign of King James the First.

presently after carried all the copes, vestments, and other ornaments over the seas to Dunkirk, where he sold them. His miserable and wretched end was, that there leaping out of one small boat into another, to go to his ship, the boat he was in, slipping away, he stepped short of the other, and so falling into the water, pitched his unhappy head upon an anchor, where he beat out his brains.

“The second, shortly after running mad, cast himself off from Dover Pier into the sea, and so was drowned.

“The third died of John Calvin’s disease; that is to say, he was eaten up with lice, being yet alive.

“The fourth, who afterwards became minister of Maidstone, falling grievously sick, endured God’s terrible judgments, for he stunk so abominably, that none, no, not his own wife, could endure to come near him; so that when they gave him meat to eat, they were forced to put it upon the end of a long pole, and so to reach it unto him through a window. For confirmation whereof there are right credible and worshipful persons yet alive who can testify the same for a certain truth.”*

It is sometimes asserted, by interested or igno-

* From the Preface to “A Devout Exposition of the Holy Mass,” by John Heigham, A.D. 1622.

rant writers, that such acts as these never took place at all until the frightful and unhappy period of the Great Rebellion. Oliver Cromwell and Lord Brooke they condemn: for Thomas Cromwell, Nicholas Ridley, Grindal, and Aylmer, they have only apologies or praise. The picture by such writers of the days of Queen Elizabeth is consequently rose-tinted, peaceful and pleasant to look upon. But it is a picture of pastoral beauty, peace, and repose drawn rather from heated imagination than from stern facts. Horrible, in truth, as were the deeds of Dowsing and Prynne sixty years later, none of them equalled in atrocity those just related; while these last-named unhappy Puritans, who had sucked in the principles of Protestantism and the rejection of all Authority with their mother's milk, must have well known by tradition hundreds of dismal precedents for their own sacrilegious iniquities and destructive acts, which may have spurred them on to overturn, murder, upheave, commit outrages, and destroy, as they did to their hearts' content.

It has been also asserted by recent writers, evidently in good faith, that the Oath of Homage as at present taken by the bishops of the Church of England is a modern invention,* unknown

* "Can any of your readers tell us something about the history of this secret oath? Who was the first bishop who

until quite recent years, or at all events of no earlier antiquity than the disordered days of the revolutionary William of Orange, and of no formal authority. These writers, however, have only unintentionally helped to darken knowledge by bold assertions which, alas! most efficiently exemplify their own ignorance and blundering. That Oath, in the actual terms still made use of, came into existence when the new Church was originally set up, and it was certainly and dutifully taken by the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury on his knees before the Queen. Sir William Cecil, no doubt, was its author, and possibly Dr. Matthew Parker himself had a hand in its revision; for he not only took it himself,* but

ventured to swear that he held his spiritualties from the Crown? Has any bishop denied this, or protested against its apparent meaning? Or will any one give an explanation of the term which will relieve consciences, and effectually meet the charges our enemies are sure to bring against us—that here is proof positive of the unmitigated Erastianism of the whole English Episcopate?”—Rev. Charles Gutch, B.D., on the “Oath of Homage.”

* The following is the Oath of Homage, taken on February 23, 1560 (See “Domestic State Papers, Elizabeth,” vol. xi.): “I, Matthew Parker, Doctor of Divinity, now elect Archbishop of Canterbury, do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, that Your Majesty is the only Supreme Governor of this Realm, and of all other Your Highness’s dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal, and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, eccle-

thus created a precedent for all his suffragans, without any single exception, the most remote as well as the more proximate.

No long period after her accession, the Lord Treasurer was directed by the Queen, under the advice of Aylmer, an exile for his Protestantism, to assign the grand and effective church of the Austin Friars in the City of London—a church, be it noted, which in Edward the Sixth's time, had already been thoroughly cleared out of all its ancient furniture and valuable ornaments, and left as bare and bald as possible—to the use of French,

siastical or spiritual, within this Realm; and therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, and authorities; and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance unto Your Majesty, Your heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, privileges, pre-eminences and authorities granted or belonging to Your Highness, Your heirs and successors, or united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm. And further, *I know-ledge and confess to have and to hold the said archbishopric of Canterbury, and the possessions of the same entirely, as well the spiritualties as temporalties thereof, only of Your Majesty and the Crown Royal of this Your Realms.* And as for the said possessions, I do my homage presently unto Your Highness, and to the same, and Your heirs and lawful successors, shall be faithful and true. So help me God, and the contents of this book.”

“ We, also, whose names be underwritten, being bishops of the several bishoprics within Your Majesty's Realm, do testify, declare, and acknowledge all and every part of the premises in like manner as the right reverend father in God, the Archbishop of Canterbury, has done.”

Flemish, and other foreign Protestants. Upon this Grindal, in full communion with the continental sectaries, applied to Calvin for a pastor, who in response despatched Monsieur Nicholas de Gallars, a French preacher, to undertake the office of superintendent there, and who received the bishop's "authority." The services, exactly modelled after those of the foreign conventicle, consisted of long prayers and longer sermons. But the disputes about free will and justification,* original sin and prevenient grace, became so fierce and furious—for the preacher was constantly answered on the spot by his hearers—that the civil authorities were often called in to settle biblical controversies, which had ended in a free fight and a riot, by turning out both preacher and hearers by force, and then locking the doors.

Moreover, some of the foreign reformers who had arrived here, in order to stir up the sluggish nature of English Protestants, were persons who had so offended against the laws of their own

* "If any preacher or parson, vicar or curate, so licensed shall fortune to preach any matter tending to dissension, or to the derogation of the religion and doctrine received, that the hearers denounce the same to the Ordinaries, or to the next bishop of the same place; but no man openly to contrary or to impugn the same speech so disorderly uttered, whereby may grow offence and disquiet of the people, but shall be convinced and reprov'd by the Ordinary."—"Articles for Doctrine and Preaching," issued by Queen Elizabeth, 1564.

country, that their presence in London was not particularly desired. We all know that justification by faith rather than by good works—for “good works are but filthy rags,” as the preachers of this new gospel maintained—was their chief and favourite dogma: a dogma not conducive either to sound morals or sober conduct. So that in the course of a very few years, *i.e.* in 1568, the Queen issued a Proclamation,* requiring all such intruding Protestants to be examined, as many of them were credibly believed to have been guilty of “rebellion, murders, robberies, or such like,” and to have only come over here to preach their blasphemous gospel in order to avoid the reasonable consequences of notorious transgressions in their own country.

Eventually, when their extravagances became dangerous and unendurable,† for it is always far

* “Wilkins’ Concilia,” vol. iv. pp. 204 and 254.

† “Here under the shelter of the Reformed Religion, they maintained several gross errors and heresies. Some of these were German Anabaptists; and others propagated opinions of a very dangerous tendency; and thus misbelief gained ground, and some of the ignorant natives were miserably misled. To stop the spreading of this infection, the Queen, by a Proclamation, ordered these hereticks, both aliens and natural-born English, to depart the kingdom within one-and-twenty days. The penalty of staying longer was imprisonment and forfeiting their goods.”—“An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain,” by Jeremy Collier, vol. vi. p. 322. London: 1846.

easier to open the flood-gates of heresy and rebellion than to close them again—these Protestants, on pain of imprisonment and loss of goods, were ordered to leave the kingdom within twenty-one days.

Such a strong measure, of course, excited them greatly; and their preachers were fierce in its denunciation and furious with Cecil. Many of them openly maintained, as Knox and Calvin had done long ago, that the rule of women in the Lord's Fold was a monstrous anomaly and a sin; and dealt out covert maledictions at the Queen and her secret love-affairs most unsparingly, using language rather forcible than choice.

Soon after the Queen's accession, Giovanni Angelo de Medicis, Pope Pius IV., wrote a beautiful and even touching letter to Her Majesty, sending it by a nuncio, the Abbot Vincent Parpaglia,* who was directed to travel through Lower

* Some writers have asserted, but with little or no evidence of the fact, that Parpaglia bore a message from the Pope volunteering to reverse his predecessor's sentence against the so-called "marriage" of Henry VIII. with Anne Boleyn, and to sanction the revolutionary changes which had been made anew in the divine office, on condition that the Queen acknowledged His Holiness's supremacy; but from the days of Camden down to those of Chancellor Harington, of Exeter, no sufficient and conclusive proofs of this proposition have been forthcoming.—See "Camden's Annals," p. 46. London: 1688. Tierney's edition of "Dodd's

Germany towards England. But the Queen, learning the purport of his coming, and having consulted her Council, who feared any change of purpose on her part, declined to allow him to land in her kingdom. He had reached Calais, but was thus compelled to return.

The paternal action of His Holiness has been so misrepresented that the actual words of his written communication ought to be carefully studied:—

“Very dear daughter in Christ, We send you greeting, health, and the apostolical benediction. How greatly We desire (Our pastoral charge so requiring it) to procure the salvation of your soul, and to provide likewise for your honour, and the security of your kingdom withal, God, Who is the Searcher of all hearts, knoweth, and you yourself may understand by what We have given in charge to this Our beloved son Vincentius Pappaglia, Abbot of St. Saviour's, a man well known to you, and well approved by Us. Wherefore, We do again and again exhort and admonish your Highness, most dear daughter, that, rejecting evil

Church History,” vol. ii. p. 147. London: 1839. “Collier's History,” vol. vi. p. 395. London: 1840. “Ware's Foxes and Firebrands,” part iii. p. 15; and “Pope Pius IV. and the Book of Common Prayer,” by E. C. Harrington. London: 1856.

counsellors, which love not you but themselves, and serve their own lusts, you would take the fear of God into council with you, and, acknowledging the time of your visitation, would show yourself obedient to Our fatherly persuasions and wholesome counsels, and promise to yourself from Us all things that may make not only to the salvation of your soul, but also whatsoever you shall desire from Us, for the establishing and confirming of your princely dignity, according to the authority, place, and office committed unto Us by God. And if so be (as We desire and hope), that you shall return into the bosom of the Church, We shall be ready to receive you with the same love, honour, and rejoicing, that the father in the gospel did his son returning to him; although Our joy is like to be the greater, in that he was joyful for the safety of one son, but you, drawing along with you all the people of England, shall hear Us and the whole company of Our brethren (who are shortly, God willing, to be assembled in a General Council, for the taking away of heresies, and so for the salvation of yourself and your whole nation,) fill the Church Universal with rejoicing and gladness. Yea, you shall make glad Heaven itself with such a memorable fact, and achieve admirable renown to your name, much more glorious than the crown you wear. But concerning this matter, the same Vincentius shall deal with

you more largely, and shall declare Our fatherly affection toward you; and We entreat your Majesty to receive him lovingly, to hear him diligently, and to give the same credit to his speeches, which you would to Ourselves.

“Given at Rome, at St. Peter’s, under the Fisherman’s Ring, May 5th, 1560, in the first year of our Pontificate.” *

Edmund Grindal, who, after a fashion, but with considerable canonical irregularities, had been elected Bishop of London, was by Parker and others consecrated at Lambeth on St. Thomas’ Day, 1559, at the same time that Richard Cocks, Rowland Meyrick, and Edwin Sandys were likewise consecrated for the sees of Ely, Bangor, and Worcester.

The first and most striking fact which was brought home to the new bishops, after they had secured possession of their temporalities, was the extremely small amount of money which the episcopal lands and manors actually produced. Many had been already sold or alienated; of those remaining, long leases had already been granted by the Crown during vacancies; and all the lands had sorely deteriorated by want of due attention

* MS. “Vatican,” 2896, n. 214. MS. “Titus,” C. vii., n. 11. Brit. Museum.

and proper cultivation. The prelates, therefore, made complaint to Sir William Cecil; but on the part of the Supreme Governess he delicately rebuked them for their importunity,* pointing out with grim satire that spiritual persons should be satisfied with spiritual things, and not look too anxiously after things temporal.

Preparations also were about this time made for filling up the many other sees vacant—a work in which Sir William Cecil took a leading and prominent part. Even at this period he foresaw clearly enough that the “foreign gospel” and its preachers might cause him considerable inconvenience. He was extremely careful, therefore, not to commit himself absolutely to their policy. And though he occasionally condescended to employ them and secure their help, he was shrewd enough to keep them all at arm’s length.

The new bishops found themselves likewise terribly embarrassed by the pressing want of clergy,†

* “When the bishops sued to the Lord Treasurer for revenue, they were merely answered that spiritual things be meetest for spiritual men.”—R——ny to Challoner, “Foreign Papers, Elizabeth,” p. 137, No. 323, Nov. 23, 1559.

† “Many of our parishes have no clergymen, and some dioceses are without a bishop. And out of that very small number who administer the sacraments throughout this great country, there is hardly one in a hundred who is both able

and had no means to their hands with which to supply it. Many of the parish churches, having lost their chief endowments and been completely cleared out of everything of value in metal,—in some nothing but a tin or latten vessel remaining for the Communion board,* the windows of the choir broken, the lead from the roofs stripped off, and side chapels or chantries often destroyed for the sake of the stones of which they had been built,—even the exiles from Geneva and elsewhere declined to serve them. Numerous cures were vacant, and several hundreds of chapelries unserved; students for the ministry at Oxford and Cambridge had been so reduced in numbers that they might be now counted rather by tens than,

and willing to preach the Word of God.”—“Zurich Letters,” 1st series, No. 35, From Thomas Lever to Bullinger, dated 10th July 1560. “In the diocese of Durham the ministry is destitute of a sufficiency of worthy men, there and in other places.”—Robert Horne, Dean of Durham, to Cecil, Nov. 13, 1560, “Foreign Papers, Elizabeth.” London: 1865.

“Where is there any learned number to supply their rooms? There be few schools abroad to bring up youth; but so many benefices so small that no men will take them; and so the parishes be unserved, and the people wax without fear of God.”—“Bishop Pilkington’s Works” (Parker Society), p. 593. London: 1842.

* “That the parish provide a decent table, standing on a frame, for the Communion table.”—“Queen Elizabeth’s Articles for Doctrine and Preaching,” 1564.

as of old, by hundreds or even by thousands.* Those of the cast-out monks who were in any way competent for the office had been duly promoted to the priesthood six years previously in Queen Mary's reign; others, however, had long ago taken to secular callings; some, again, had become parish clerks and sextons; some had been charged on suspicion, captured, and allowed to rot in prison; others had gone abroad in their extremity; a few, in despair of securing anything more suitable, had undertaken the office of steward to noblemen and gentlemen who had obtained possession of the monastic lands; while many of the monks had found, what had been denied to them throughout the last years of their chequered lives, peace and rest in death.

Amongst the more fanatical innovators, preaching, and the desire to attend it, had at this time become such a rage—the Communion table, as well actually as metaphorically, being now wholly overshadowed by the pulpit—that unless a divine

* In the year 1561, as Anthony à Wood has put on record, so frightful was the emptiness and depression at Oxford, that throughout the whole year there were no degrees given “in Divinity, and but one in the Civil Law, three in Physic, and eight in Arts,” and, in the Act of the same year, “not one in Divinity, Law, or Physic.” The students also were so poor and beggarly that many of them were forced this and the year following to obtain license under the Commissary Seal, to require the alms of well-disposed people.—“Annals of the University,” by Anthony à Wood. *Sub anno*, 1561.

could expound a crabbed text with art, skilfully analyse its various parts in detail, compare it with twenty other texts dealing with the same or a similar subject, and then adroitly branch off with perplexing dissertations in half-a-dozen unexpected directions, he was fearlessly written down as at once incompetent and godless, lacking spiritual gifts and free grace, a mere dumb dog, unworthy of hire or notice.

Such treasures as those who could thus preach popularly for two hours or so without any break or mishap, were still few and far between. Though fully appreciated, they could not be secured every day or anywhere. Their homiletic gifts were choice, rare, and superfine. The demand for them, consequently, was greatly in excess of the supply. But even these when handling Scripture—often casting pearls before swine—were properly shunned, with a shudder, by those who at heart clung to the Ancient Faith.

Inferior officers of the Establishment, the illiterate and ill-mannered, the “sundry artificers” and those of “base occupation,” to whom Parker and Grindal had, it may be supposed, given some kind of ordination, and a special commission to preach,* were required, instead of “holding

* “The supply of clergy was insufficient, and even the withdrawal or removal of what but for this would have been

forth out of their own heads"—as the phrase then stood, and so remained almost to our own day—were required to deliver over and over again the “godly” but somewhat coarse-linguaged Homilies which the innovators had authoritatively put forth for the practical use of their ill-instructed,* ignorant, and vulgar allies. If these Homilies in question were those which satisfied the not over-refined tastes of the new prelates, we need not stay to contemplate what was the kind of taste popular with these new and too-truly “inferior” clergy.

The dearth of spiritual privileges and the desolation consequent thereupon, became by consequence truly awful. Churches were closed, for there were none to serve them. Infants remained unbaptized, women were not churched, children

so considerable a portion as one in fifty-three of the beneficed clergy in England, seriously embarrassed the new bishops. As in other times, men unqualified by learning, and by the possession of clerical gravity, or deficient in regard to our ideal moral standard, however truly they conformed to the naturally low standard of general morality, were ordained and beneficed to supply the deficiency of the first years of the reign of Elizabeth.”—“The English Episcopate at the Accession of Elizabeth,” p. 289. “Union Review.” London: 1875.

* “We are only wanting in preachers, and of these there is a great and alarming scarcity. The schools also are entirely deserted.”—“Zurich Letters,” John Jewell to Peter Martyr, 1st Series, No. 38. Parker Society.

were uninstructed. In some places the dead were buried, like dogs, without either rite or ceremony; save that poor and pious neighbours gathered near to tell their beads and recite the *De profundis*, and this often at the risk of condign punishment.

Even in cathedrals the Communion was administered but once a quarter, though ordered once a month. Sometimes the authorities tolerated the ministerial acts of persons who had not received any but Presbyterian ordination, and possibly not even that. The "Lord's board," as it was called, was brought down with its tressels from the east end of the chancel,* and placed, as for a domestic meal, with benches round, in the middle of the choir. It was covered with an ample table-napkin of Damascus cloth. A large leathern bottle of wine,† a loaf of bread, and a

* The table is ordered to be "set in the place where the altar stood . . . saving when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be distributed, at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort within the chancel. . . . After the Communion is done, from time to time, the same holy table to be placed where it stood before."—Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, 1559.

† "A bottyl of leather and a flagon of white metall for wine for the Supper."—Churchwarden's Accounts of St. Mary Magdalene's, Oxford, 1551-2. "Item, whether you have a faire potte or two of pewter for the sweet keeping of the wine?"—William Chaderton's Visitation Articles for the Diocese of Lincoln, A.D. 1603. "The bread delivered to

knife, sometimes a pewter plate and flagon, or occasionally a wooden platter and a tin cup, were by the sexton then placed upon it. A cushion and a Prayer Book of the latest revision completed the *ornamenta*. The proceedings began by the singing of a hymn.* Round the table the people sat or stood. The minister, though ordered to go to its north end by the direction of the rubric, often stood at the eastern† part, or seated himself in an arm-chair, where he alternately preached and prayed. When the service was over, what remained of the bread and wine was passed round again to the congregation, who helped themselves, and so were communicated, after a fashion, twice over; the bottles and flagons were then taken away, the cloth removed, and the table often lifted back again to its place under the east wall.

the communicants be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats. . . . No other bread to be used by the minister.”—William Overton’s Visitation Articles, 1584.

* “There may be sung a hymn or such-like song to the praise of Almighty God in the best sort of melody and music that may be conveniently devised, having respect that the sentence [Qy. sense] of the hymn may be understood and perceived.”—Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, 1559.

† “The minister, when there is no Communion, useth a surplice only, standing on the east side of the table, with his face towards the people.”—Strype’s “Life of Parker,” vol. i. p. 365.

Such was the ordinary rule and custom with reference to what was termed “the Supper.”

Some of the more fanatical and mad of the innovating party, however, adopting the Protestant method of interpretation of Scripture, maintained that even such practices were wrong, and without biblical authority, and that the Lord’s Supper ought to be something very different—a well-prepared and substantial meal, at which the faithful could satisfy the cravings of hunger with “a variety and abundance of meat and drink.” * Ever since the days of St. Paul, the Catholic Church, as they so modestly maintained, had been in blind error. It was thus reserved to certain infallible innovators of the sixteenth century, madmen, fanatics, and demon-possessed, to re-deliver the lost Truth. One fool often makes many. There were several who enthusiastically embraced this new and remarkable idea.

* Robert Cooke, one of the gentlemen of the Queen’s Chapel, wrote: “My remarks relate to the Last Supper of Christ, in the administration of which a mistake is made now-a-days, and ever has been almost from the time of St. Paul: since he placed before the Corinthians a supper to be eaten; we only a morsel of bread in mockery of a supper. They used a variety and abundance of meat and drink, so as to depart satisfied; we return hungry.”—Robert Cooke to Rodolph Gualter, “Zurich Letters,” 2nd Series, Letter 95.

When such services as that just described were calmly contrasted with the ancient and familiar Mass,* no wonder that the dazed and staggered people felt disposed to leave the despoiled and empty churches to the owls and bats; no wonder that, as was so often the case, they refused to enter them. Except with those who were on the look-out for their own advancement, the changes effected were most unpopular. Some of the new bishops, in their exuberant piety, scolded like angry fishwomen, or swore like their Royal Mistress,†

* "For their continual massing afore noon, we praise God that hath delivered us from it, as a thing contrary to His holy will and ordinance. St. Paul says that when they came together to eat the Lord's Supper they should tarry one for another; but these shorn, shaveling, shameless priests would neither remain together one with another, nor yet let the people have any part with them. Every one would creep into a corner to an altar alone, there lift up on high, eat and drink up all alone, sell good pennyworths, and bless them with the empty chalice."—"Bishop Pilkington's Works," Parker Society, p. 528. London: 1842.

† "The choleric oaths and manifold rare upbraidings" [of my Lord of Hereford] "be of no avail with the bastards of Antichrist, though spoken in the Quene's Majestie's name."—Again: John Best, Bishop of Carlisle, writing to Cecil, reports the state of his diocese. "The priestes are wicked impes of Antichrist, for the most part very ignorant and stubborn; past measure false and subtle."—"Domestic State Papers, Elizabeth," vol. xvii.

For a due account of Her Majesty's ability and proficiency in profane swearing, the reader should consult her godson Sir John Harington's "Nugæ Antiquæ."

but neither bad language nor coarse oaths served the cause of the New Gospel, which in many parts sorely languished. The novel title of Supreme Governness, the new-fangled supremacy itself, with all its complex consequences, as well as the newly-revised Prayer Book, were each and all disliked. Nothing in the recent Proclamation had commended itself to the great body of the People—whether ancient nobility, lawful clergy, or gentlemen of blood and estate be comprehended in that wide but ambiguous term—and a large and influential majority refused to acquiesce in the changes.

What, therefore, the upholders of Might against Right were compelled to attempt, could only be effected by a tortuous and astute policy; not by direct but by crooked courses; and these were taken artfully and warily, according to varying circumstances and by the aid of means ready to hand. The work was done by degrees, and in the manner and by a method now to be described.

The Oath of Supremacy was duly tendered to all the clergy in accordance with the recent enactment. Many important offices were vacant. By almost the whole of the leading dignitaries of the Church it was firmly and resolutely refused. More than twelve of the deans deliberately declined to take it, and, as some avowed, were quite prepared for the consequences of their refusal.

Numbers of the archdeacons, canons, and prebendaries did the same,* as did also numerous heads of colleges and influential members of the two Universities. Amongst the parochial clergy, an important rather than a considerable minority were likewise equally true to the Faith of their Fathers; declining with firmness and resolution to acknowledge an illegitimate woman as, in any form or shape, or because of any legislation, the Supreme Governess of the Church of England. In this they were sometimes supported by the public.† Many of them, however, were passive and obedient, waiting for another change, and hoping earnestly for better and brighter times. One re-action had happily taken place; others, they assumed, might possibly follow.

As a consequence of their refusal, certain of

* "The whole of the clergy deprived at this time stands thus: fourteen bishops, already mentioned; three bishops-elect, one abbot, four priors, and one abbess; twelve deans, fourteen archdeacons, sixty canons or prebendaries, one hundred priests, well-preferred; fifteen heads of colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, to which may be added about twenty doctors in several faculties."—"Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain," by Jeremy Collier, vol. vi. p. 242. London: 1846.

† On the inauguration of Dr. Francis as the new Protestant Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, there was a serious riot.—Letter of Scholars of Oxford to Cecil, May 11, 1561. "Domestic State Papers, Elizabeth," No. 7, vol. xvii.

the dignitaries in question were either cast into prison and loaded with chains, or promptly banished the realm. No favour was shown to any who resisted the enactment, except, for personal reasons, to a few feeble and worn-out clergy who were cruelly denied the consolations of religion, confined to special localities, and not permitted to go beyond well-defined limits. But the old priests* retained their well deserved popularity. The Friars Observant at Greenwich, some of the Benedictines from Westminster, the Carthusian Fathers in Richmond, as well as the Bridgetine Nuns of Sion House, one and all, marking the signs of the times, left their desolated country, and for ever turned their backs upon their former sacred homes. Persons of blood and rank, noblemen and gentlemen, and sometimes, indeed, noble and delicate ladies likewise, cheerfully left their pleasant mansions and ancient possessions, suffering any spoiling of their goods and destitution rather than give up their Faith. The most respected and best learned of the universities, be-

* Some old priests, Brigg, Blaxton, Arden, Gregory, and others, though driven out of Exeter, were received in Bishop Scory's diocese (Hereford) with acclamation, and feasted in the streets by torchlight—of which he wrote and made complaint.—“Domestic State Papers, 1547–1580,” Aug. 17, 1561.

coming exiles, were scattered throughout foreign lands, weeping by strange waters because of the religious desolation of their native homes. Some found a refuge and home in Flanders, others in France, some in Italy. As regards the latter country, it is interesting to remember that the saintly Archbishop of Milan, Charles Borromeo, received the English exiles in that beautiful city with cordial kindness. He truly bound up their spiritual wounds, pouring in oil and wine. For several years, indeed, His Grace's own confessor was a Welsh canon, Dr. Griffith Roberts, and his last grand vicar was another Welshman, Dr. Owen Lewis.

For the inferior clergy these days were indeed days of trial. Many of them obviously conformed to the new order of things for fear of poverty, others because they preferred the license and freedom which an acceptance of the new doctrines practically ensured. Step by step, those who would not take the Oath of Supremacy* were "weeded out," as one of the new prelates phrased it; but, though the Visitors and Commissioners

* Those who resigned their appointments rather than do so were possibly under two hundred and fifty in number; but of those who remained, hoping for another change and better days, several hundreds, possibly some thousands, heartily disliked the new religion and its founders.

appointed by the Queen went about their work with a will, the practical difficulties which met them at every turn were considerable. Though the innovators were a small minority, they were united and determined, while the great body of the people were against the changes; and the hearty resolutions of such were constantly met with by those violent and foul-mouthed officials who had been sent forth to continue and complete the revolution.* By degrees, however, because of the constant and continual fines imposed for nonconformity, many who clung to the ancient faith did not altogether decline to attend the new service, and even to receive the bread and wine distributed at what was called "the Supper of the Lord."

The exact state of affairs at this melancholy period was graphically described by a competent judge and author, Edward Rishton, a watchful and observant priest, who followed a considerable number of the clergy of the ancient faith, in a total denial of the validity and value of

* John Scory, Bishop of Hereford, writes to Cecil, June 21, 1561, to say that there are great disorders in the Cathedral church of his diocese, which, he charitably remarks, is "a very nurserye of blasphemy, whordom, pryde, superstition, and ignorance."—"Domestic State Papers, Elizabeth," vol. xvii. No. 32.

the new ordinations. Some moderns may have desired, and yet desire, that a different contemporary judgment might have been given at the time when the new rites and regulations were first set forth and adopted; but, from the days of Thomas Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph,* to those of Canon Edgar Estcourt of St. Chad's Cathedral in Birmingham, one uniform opinion and tradition appears to have been held. The limited number of exceptions only serve to prove the rule.

“It may be confidently asserted,” writes Canon Estcourt, “that there is an unbroken tradition from the year 1554 to the present time, confirmed by constant practice in France and Rome, as well as in this country, in accordance with which Anglican ordinations are looked upon as

* A contemporary inquiry was made at Rome in the spring of the year 1570, as well concerning the character of the new orders as of the assumed prelatial dignities held by those who had not been previously ordained priests. Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph, gave his opinion, as did also Dr. Nicholas Morton, of the diocese of York; Henry Henshaw, of the diocese of Lincoln; Edmund Daniel, Dean of Hereford; Thomas Kinton, of the diocese of Sarum, and others. All the opinions of these persons were against the validity of the new rites and ordinations. See, for the document itself, the Continuation of the “Annals of Baronius,” by Laderchius, vol. iii. pp. 197 *et seq.*

absolutely null and void; and Anglican ministers are treated simply as laymen, so that those who wish to become priests have to be ordained unconditionally. Not a single instance to the contrary can be alleged.”*

There are certain difficulties which, it must be frankly allowed, have been always felt by learned Roman Catholics and Orientals with regard to the fact of Parker's consecration, and which must be duly faced and removed before any recognition of the validity of English ordinations can be reasonably expected either from the Eastern or Western Churches. Anglicans must not remain contented with assertions which appear to satisfy themselves, but be prepared with arguments and conclusions which will convince their opponents.

The modern Easterns, though personally civil and polite enough, frequently repudiate our ordinations with scorn. The late Archbishop of Syros and Tenos, even more civil than some of his brethren, re-ordained absolutely, the Rev. James Chrystal, an American clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church; while the Servian Archimandrite, who once gave the Holy Communion to a

* The “Question of Anglican Ordinations discussed,” by E. E. Estcourt, M.A., pp. 145-6. London: 1873.

London clergyman, the Rev. William Denton, who had rendered good service to the Servian Church, was most severely reprimanded by Authority, and made to give a promise in writing that he would never repeat that his canonical offence; and this in a formal document which described the Church of England as "unorthodox" and "Protestant," and the clergyman in question as "without the priesthood." At Rome every care is taken to arrive at the truth, so that the inadequate defences regarded as sufficient and satisfactory by some at home, will never pass muster in the presence of the skilled theologians of the Eternal City. The author had hoped (if he may be pardoned for writing thus,) that his book maintaining the Validity of the Ordinations of the Church of England, in which he made the best defence in his power, might have called our bishops' attention to a subject of the gravest moment, which touches the organic life of the Established Church; but at present these have made no sign. A huge assumption, as Roman Catholic theologians maintain, that all was right in Parker's case, is of course easily enough made; but detailed proofs of facts and satisfactory replies to objectors often give trouble, entail research, and yet remain insufficient for the purpose.

As regards the *fact* of Parker's consecration at

Lambeth on the 17th of December, 1559, it must be admitted that the following difficulties appear to exist :—

1. The Lambeth Register was not publicly produced—in fact no reference, either in attack or defence, was made to it of any sort or kind—until 1613, fifty-three years after the date of Parker's consecration, though the new bishops had been constantly pressed to show some written proofs of their consecration by Nicholas Sander, William Allen, Stapleton Bristow, Reynolds, and more especially by Harding in his "Confutation of Jewell's Apologie," first published only six years after Parker's consecration, *i.e.* in 1565. Why it was not produced is, to say the least, singular, if not mysterious.

2. Stowe the chronicler, though he, as any reader may see, was often exact and circumstantial in recording the most trivial matters, and duly put on record the consecration of Reginald Pole and others, omitted by some strange oversight any account whatsoever of Parker's consecration; though he was very intimate with this new prelate, and was often a guest at Lambeth Palace.

3. Holinshed and Stowe both state that *Archbishop* Parker, and Grindal, *Bishop* of London, were present at the obsequies of Henry II., King of France, performed in St. Paul's Cathedral

on the 8th and 9th of September 1559;* yet the first, Parker, was certainly not consecrated until December 19th, and Grindal not until the 21st of that same month. The terms "archbishop" and "bishop," therefore, were consequently most inexact; unless, indeed, the Queen's Letters Patent enjoining the respective Chapters to elect these persons, were regarded by Stowe as of more importance than any other previous or subsequent rite.

4. From an original document in the State Paper Office,† it is clear that Matthew Parker, who then styled himself "elect Archbishop of Canterbury," did homage for his temporalities before the Queen at Westminster in February 1559. At that period he certainly was neither elected nor consecrated, and it is equally certain

* Parker had been elected on August 1st. In a letter to the Privy Council, dated the 27th of that month, he signed it "Matth. C[antuar.]" And it appears, as Canon Estcourt points out (on p. 83 of his "Question of Anglican Ordinations"), that he is addressed in the same style in official documents. Another remarkable error is that, in an Order of the Queen, dated October 26th, it is asserted that, amongst others, the Elect-Bishop of Chichester, Dr. William Barlow, "remain unconsecrated."—"State Papers, Elizabeth," vol. vii. p. 19.

† It is referred to in the "State Papers of Elizabeth, Domestic," vol. xi., under the date 23rd February 1560, and is printed at length in Collier's "Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, vol. ix. pp. 331-2. London: 1846.

that bishops did not usually do such homage until their consecration had been effected. Here it may be remarked by some that February 1559 may possibly mean February 1560; but if so, then the Lambeth Register, in which his consecration is recorded as having taken place in December 1559, is altogether wrong, for Parker, in February 1560, could never have then wittingly termed himself merely "elect archbishop," when, according to the said Register, he had been actually consecrated two months previously.

5. Again. There is in the State Paper Office* a Commission from the Queen, constituting Parker, who is termed "Archbishop-elect of Canterbury," Grindal, who is styled "Bishop-elect of London," and others, Commissioners for carrying into execution the Acts for the Uniformity of Common Prayer, and for restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction of the State Ecclesiastical. This document is dated the 19th of July 1559, nearly a fortnight before the election of Parker to the See of Canterbury, which took place on the 1st of August; consequently the use of the term "bishop-elect" is inexact, or else the dates of the Lambeth Register, as regards these events, are

* "Domestic State Papers, Elizabeth," vol. v. No. 18. London: 1856.

wrong. At all events this State Paper is distinctly and remarkably out of harmony with them.

Whether these various difficulties, either apparent or real, are not removed by the knowledge that certain independent documents exist plainly proving that the ceremony took place on December 17, 1559, is, of course, quite another question, which each investigator must determine for himself after duly weighing the harmonious or conflicting evidence on both sides. But that the evidence is conflicting, and that difficulties do exist, cannot be doubted.

There are some persons, it should here be noted, who go further, and maintain that the whole of the first and earlier parts of Parker's Register, including the heraldic title-page, are in one handwriting; and that this is of a later date than 1559, possibly of the subsequent reign of James I., when, in the new Church of England, different and less questionable opinions concerning the subject began to prevail. But this, of course, is a subject for impartial Catholic theologians and skilled paleographers satisfactorily to decide.

Immediately the clergy found themselves at liberty to enter the honourable estate of matrimony, most of the reforming party took to themselves wives. Some had already done so secretly. Archbishop Cranmer's distinguished precedent of

having had two,* was in many cases dutifully followed by the new bishops,—though, of course, these wives were procured one after the other, and not both at the same time. But these married prelates, and, indeed, the married clergy likewise, were looked upon with intense dislike, and often with contempt, by the people in general; while the terms which were sometimes applied both to their wives and children were much more plain and impressive than complimentary.† Even the Queen's Highness disliked the wives of prelates. As a rule, the reforming clergy, when waxing amorous, could only secure helpmeets from the lowest of the people—almost all others turned aside with disgust at the proposal;‡ while many of those thus secured owned questionable or fly-blown characters, had been waiting-women, ale-house attendants, or publicly disreputable. The gravest scandals by consequence arose in several places,§ to which from time to time the attention

* "The husband of *one* wife."—Titus i. 6.

† See "Briefe Confutation of a Godlie Warning," p. 47. London: 1572.

‡ "No knight's daughter, nor esquire's, could be so certified to accept of him."—"Briefe Confutation," &c., p. 50.

§ "Because there hath grown offence, and some slander to the Church, by lack of discreet and sober behaviour in many ministers of the Church, both in choosing of their wives, and indiscreet living with them, the remedy whereof is necessary to be sought."—Queen Elizabeth's "Injunctions to the Clergy," A.D. 1559.

of the Queen's Privy Councillors was officially drawn. On two occasions Sir William Cecil wrote contemptuously of those whose matrimonial acts had been called into question, to the great annoyance of Parker. The subject was new, and certainly difficult. Sir John Mason informed Cecil that "in sundry particular churches at this present [there is] such fleshly demeanour in appearance, as small difference is to be seen in any point between them and lay-houses, wherewith the World taketh occasion of offence, and God, I think, is not much pleased."* Some other instances of wantonness and demoralization in the houses of the ministers cannot be further alluded to.

The Queen's Injunctions had laid down some excellent and practical rules on the subject; but they appear to have been too generally disregarded. When a minister or deacon had made choice of some buxom woman or country lass, and she was certified to be ready, or at least not unwilling, to accept him, the bishop of the diocese and two neighbouring justices of the peace on some holiday, and in church in presence of the congregation, were to examine her personally, "behind and before, in mind and in body, by in-

* "State Papers," Aug. 11, 1561. Sir John Mason to Secretary Cecil.

spection and by report," to see that she was whole and sound, healthy, and of good repute, free from either moral or physical blemish;* and, in order to find this out, her parents, or, if they were dead, two of her nearest kinsfolk, or "her master or mistress whom she serveth," being summoned to appear, "shall make a good and certain proof thereof" both to the minister of the parish and to the assembled congregation. Such was usually known as a "matrimonial inquisition": profane or over-witty persons sometimes gave it a less pleasant name. Having passed through this disagreeable but perhaps necessary ordeal, the bishop and the magistrates, if satisfied, gave permission, under their hands and seals, to the two persons more particularly interested to gratify their praiseworthy intentions "with all due and convenient speed."

A similar process was also necessary and enjoined by the Queen in the case of bishops. Only here special commissioners of rank—not mere justices of the peace—were appointed to under-

* A transcript of the minutes of such an examination—"Inquisitio Matrimonialis," &c.—is before me as I write. It took place in an Oxfordshire Peculiar of the ancient diocese of Lincoln, before its re-arrangement; and, though faithfully paraphrased in the text above, is, in some of its details, far too coarse to be verbally quoted.

take the needful examination, and with these were associated the venerable metropolitan, himself a married man. For such an exalted ecclesiastical officer this was certainly a new, as no doubt it must have been an interesting, duty.

Deans of cathedrals and heads of houses, fired with matrimonial ambitions, when proposing to wed, were to apply to the official Visitor of their respective institutions, whose duty it was, as the Supreme Governness enjoined, to make a similar personal examination of the wife-designate, and to see that the proposed union "tend not to the hindrance of their house."

Archbishop Parker was terribly mortified at the Queen's formal edict about the marriage of the clergy, and horrified at her unscriptural and unfeeling language. He wrote to Sir William Cecil*

* Parker, in this letter, asserts of the Queen that he was "in an horror to hear such words to come from her mild nature and Christianly learned conscience, as she spake concerning God's holy ordinance and institution of matrimony." And again, "To tarry in cathedral churches with such open and rebukeful separations, what modest nature can abide it? Or tarry where they be discredited. Horsekeepers' wives, porters', pantlers', and butlers' wives may have their cradles going; and honest learned men expelled with open note, who only keep the hospitality, who only be students and preachers, who only be unfeigned orators in open prayers for the Queen's Majesty's prosperity and continuance, where others say their back paternosters for her in corners."—Parker to Cecil, Petyt MSS., No. 47, folio 374.

to explain his manifold grievances, and evidently looked for some word of consolation from him. He went so far as to lament that under such conditions he had ever accepted the See of Canterbury. If the bishops' inferior servants might have their wives within the precincts of the cathedrals, and in the useful out-houses of the episcopal palaces—if these respectable officers might rock their offspring's cradles, why might not the lady of the most reverend and loyal Primate of all England do the same? Parker evidently was very sore at what he termed these "rebukeful separations."

Bishop Cocks of Ely likewise on his own part complained loudly to Archbishop Parker that the "women of the bishops and prebendaries" were by the Queen's Majesty's edict turned out of the colleges and precincts of the cathedrals. He wrote, "forasmuch as it is not needful, but at this time very miserable, and sounding contrary to the ordinance of the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures of God," he hoped that the edict might be withdrawn. He went on to inform his afflicted metropolitan that there was then but "one prebendary dwelling with his family in Ely Church," and if the wife and children were turned out, the prebendary himself would go. "Turn him out," wrote the bishop, plaintively, "doves and owls may dwell there for any continual housekeeping.

It is miserable that the poor man's family should be turned out, and miserable that such a number of houses should be left desolate." * Expressive sentences like this sufficiently set forth the awful havoc which had been made in the garden of God by these "wild boars" of the Reformation. They had indeed rooted up the garden, for, where flowers of grace erewhile grew in abundance, now only sterility and desolation reigned.

As regards the practical action of those who resisted the innovators, we may learn much from the following interesting and pregnant words:—

"At the same time they had mass said secretly in their own houses by those very priests who in church publicly celebrated the spurious liturgy, and sometimes by others who had not defiled themselves with heresy; yea, and very often in those disastrous times were on one and the same day partakers of the Table of our Lord and of the table of devils; that is, of the Blessed Eucharist and of the Calvinistic Supper. Yea, what is still more marvellous and more sad, sometimes the priest saying mass at home, for the sake of those Catholics whom he knew to be desirous of them, carried about him Hosts consecrated

* Petyt MSS., No. 47, folio 378, in the Inner Temple.

according to the rite of the Church, with which he communicated them at the very time in which he was giving to other Catholics more careless about the Faith the bread prepared for them according to the heretical rite." *

When the Queen visited Canterbury, she was received pontifically, as the Head of the Church of England. On one occasion Parker, supported by the Bishops of Lincoln and Rochester, met her outside the west door. There a "grammarian" made a long-winded oration in her praise, in which the words *Ave! Eliza*, and numerous exaggerated epithets were used. Then, alighting from her horse, she entered the cathedral, where the Psalm *Deus misereatur* and some collects were said. The choir-men and boys, with the dean and prebendaries, stood in order on either side, and "brought Her Majesty up with a square song, she going under a canopy, borne by four of her temporal knights, to the traverse, placed by the Communion board, where she heard evensong." †

* Continuation of the "History" by Rev. Edward Rish-ton, B.A., B.N.C., Oxon.; edited by David Lewis, M.A.; p. 267. London: 1877.

† This is Parker's own description of the event. See Petyt MSS., No. 47, folio 22. "The Communion board" is what the writers of the old religion termed "the Protestant oyster-board," which it no doubt greatly resembled.

In 1560 the Geneva Bible was printed and circulated. Both in Preface and Notes the false doctrines of Calvin were studiously inculcated; and, being popular with the now extending Puritan party, it had a considerable circulation, exercising much influence. Some of its Notes were obviously directed against prelacy; while others were so grossly heretical, that, in the then excited state of public opinion, their evil teaching was avowedly feared by the bishops. These superintending officials, though much divided both in faith and opinion, were mainly desirous of doing what the Queen enjoined upon them, and of subserviently following Her Highness's spiritual directions, however much they might change or vary; yet at the same time feared altogether to offend their foreign allies and Puritanical supporters. Archbishop Parker, therefore, arranged that Cranmer's English version of the Scriptures should be at once revised and re-issued—a work which was accomplished about eight years afterwards, and is the foundation of our present English version of the Bible.

Early in the year 1563, Parliament met and considered more important measures concerning religion (or irreligion, as some might phrase it) and the new Church. The wheels of the Establishmentarian machine often creaked and groaned, and continually stuck in the progress of ordinary

motion ; for the concern was lumbering, unwieldy, ill-planned and rudely constructed, and made extremely little way onwards.

To drop a simile. The confusion which reigned when Puritans, Catholics, and State-religionists were in constant and active conflict, was steadily increasing. In many places disorders of a gross character were abounding. The laxest doctrines of common morality were proclaimed by the new preachers, who were at once venal and "godly." Vapid and vain sentiments were highly valued, more especially by the foolish persons who uttered them ; while good works, looked upon by some as external tokens of predestined reprobation, seem to have been altogether at a discount.

At the same time these self-constituted prophets pushed themselves and their wares to the fore-front ; and in scriptural phraseology, interlarded often with highly scurrilous assertions, condemned all those who would not promote, or abhorred, the New Gospel ; proclaiming for such, temporal ruin here and everlasting misery hereafter. Sometimes with the solemn deliverance of prophecies they combined the practices of palmistry, necromancy,* and astrology. Others,

* A certain William Wycherley practised necromancy, from whose formal depositions the following is taken:—"23rd August. *Item*, he saith that about ten years past he used a circule called *Circulus Salamonis* at a place called

again, called up, or professed to call up, familiar spirits whom they consulted; or peered into a crystal globe either to watch distant events therein revealed, or to obtain guidance in seeking for hidden treasures. When it was known that the Queen and some of her new nobility consulted such professors, it need not cause surprise that the common people followed their example. By a fanciful study of the armorial bearings granted to some new peer or recently-made knight, some of these likewise—seers of the New Gospel—professed to forecast the certain future of those who bore the arms, and to unfold for such the mysteries and marvels of coming years. In the royal arms the proximity of the Lilies of France with the Lions of England, led some of the prophets—why,

Pembsam [Qy. Pepplesham], in Sussex, to call up *Baro*, whom he taketh [to be] an Orientalle or septentrionale spirit. Where was also one Robert Bayly, the scriere of the cristalle stone; Syr John Anderson, the *magister operator*; Syr John Hickley, and Thomas Goslyng, in the which their practice they had sword, ring, and holly water; where they were frustrated, for *Baro* did not appere, nor other vision of spirit, but there was a terrible wind and tempest for the time of the circulation. *Per me* Wylliam Wycherley. . . . Maier, a preest, and now lay-master of the Mynt at Durham House, hath conjured for treasure and their stolen goods. Sir John Lloyd, a preest that sometime dwelt at Godstone, besides Croydon, hath used it likewise. Thomas Owldring of Yarmouth, is a conjuror, and hath very good books of conjuring, and that a great number.”—Lansdowne MSS., British Museum, vol. ii. art. 26.

is not on record—to predict either sudden death or a disagreeable future for the Queen; reports of which reaching Her Highness's ears caused her to fume, fret, and even to swear right royally. Many members of the old and noble families, as well as the "new men"—who had pushed themselves forward, and, because of their greed and rapacity, were not over-popular,—became the subjects of such-like prophetic inspiration. Those who were superstitious, and many of them were this, gravely feared the prophets in question and trembled when they heard their predicted doom. In alliance with the prophets came the perambulating conjurors who, on a slightly different platform, undertook to prove by ocular demonstration, to the shallow or to those who thought themselves wise, the impossibility of the reality or value of the Sacrament of the Altar; and who, clothed in disused or imitation sacerdotal vestments, and by the aid of tin cups and thin pellets of bone, on which were engraved representations of the enemy of souls, or some inferior demon, most profanely caricatured the Mass and its manual actions, with utterances of "*Mumpsimus*" and "*Sumpsimus*," and the still-used phrase of harmless modern conjurors, "*Hocus-pocus*." *

* A horrible travestie of the words of consecration in the Canon of the Mass, "*Hoc est Corpus Meum*."

The work of destroying the ancient faith of a nation is of course never so difficult as the work of building it up. Hence, when in the interests of Cecil, Bacon, and Walsingham, the ballad-singers, the self-constituted prophets, and the wandering conjurors were openly allied with the Establishmentarian preachers and diocesan superintendents, (while the representatives of the old system were thumb-screwed, hung, or banished,) the work of destruction and corruption, of course, went on apace.

But the prophets and conjurors were so personally distasteful to the Queen and her Council, having caused them so much annoyance, that in 1563 Parliament promptly passed an Act* against "fond and fantastical prophecies," in which the punishments were most severe. Persons convicted of excogitating or spreading prophecies founded on the armorial bearings of any nobleman, knight, or gentleman, or upon the days of the month or year on which they had been born or ennobled, were rendered punishable with a year's imprisonment and a fine of ten pounds, for the first offence; and to the forfeiture of all their goods and chattels and imprisonment for life, for the second. By the same severe enactment, any

* 5 Elizabeth, c. 15, 16.

persons practising “conjurations, enchantments, and witchcraft” were declared felons, and ordered to be punished as such without the benefit of clergy. If, however, the witchcraft was not directed against the life of any one, perpetual imprisonment was the extremest punishment permitted.

But all such measures were impotent to do the work intended. The flood-gates of impiety, superstition, and disorder had been deliberately opened by those who had assumed power; but it was seen to be no easy task to close them again.

As to the bishops of the new sort, they found themselves hampered and hindered on all sides. For not a tenth part of the people, even in the towns and cathedral cities, went with the Reformers,*

* On January 12th, 1562, in a Letter to Cecil, Bishop Horne gave a deplorable account of the Protestant cause at Winchester: “Having many ways endeavored and travailed to bring and reduce the inhabitants of the City of Winchester to good uniformity in religion, and namely to have the cures there served, as the Common Prayer might be frequented, which hath not been done sithence the massing-time; and also that good and sound doctrine might be taught amongst them, which they as yet do not so well like and allow, I could not by any means hitherto bring the same to pass. . . . The said inhabitants are very stubborn, whose reformation would help the greatest part of the shire bent that way, and I would the rather have this brought to pass, for that some of them have boasted and vaunted that do what I can I shall not have my purpose. . . . Sundry there are in the shire, which have borne great countenance in

while scarcely a fifth of those in rural villages and hamlets were prepared to accept the new religion. But those who had grasped the whip-handle of Authority or Might declined to slacken their hold upon it; while any dutiful return of the nation to faith and obedience was held to be simply out of the question.

A study of the "Visitation Articles" and "Injunctions" of the bishops, show evidently enough the true state of their dioceses. As to the old churches, most of them had been thoroughly cleared out of all their sacred ornaments.* Rood-

late times, which hinder as much as they can the proceedings in religion."—Original MS. in State Paper Office.

* For example, in John Parkhurst's "Visitation Articles for the Diocese of Norwich," A.D. 1561, the following inquiry is made of the various churchwardens:—"Whether all alters, images, holi-water stones, pictures, paintings, as of Th'assumption of the Blessed Virgin, of the descending of Christ into the Virgin in the fourme of a little boy at Th'annunciation of the Aungell, and al other superstitious and dangerous monuments, especiallie paintings and imagies in walle, boke, cope, banner, or els where, of the Blessed Trinitie, or of the Father (of whom there can be no image made), be defaced and removed out of the churche and other places, and are destroyed, and the places where such impietie was, so made up as if there had been no suche thing there." And, again, Grindal inquired "Whether in your churches and chappels all alters be utterly taken down and cleane removed, even unto the foundation; and the place where they stood paved, and the wall whereunto they joined whited over and made uniform with the rest, so as no breach or rupture appear. And whether your rood-lofts be taken downe, and

lofts had been hewn down; pictures, paintings, and banners, looked upon as tokens of "impietie," had followed the vessels of silver and gold. Almost everything, including screens, woodwork, roofs, and walls, had been painfully whitewashed. As to the new ministers, disorder and confusion, irregularities and examples of self-will, were everywhere apparent, and the bishops could do little or nothing to mend matters. These poor perplexed officials of the Supreme Governess, not having learnt to obey, were in no case competent to rule. Certain of the principles which they had imbibed abroad were at once heretical and revolutionary; so no wonder that Disorder reigned throughout the land, and self-pleasing was the leading principle which guided men's minds. When once the principle of "Reform" had been duly and practically admitted, every one had his own nostrum for the existing national sickness; while no one exactly approved of that change which his neighbour had endeavoured to effect or had effected. The "reforms" which the mushroom peers had daringly carried out, and by which they

altered, so that the upper partes thereof with the sollar or loft be quite taken down unto the crosse-beame, and that the said beame have some convenient creast put upon the same." —"Articles to be Enquired of, &c., by Edmond Grindall, Archbishop of York, A.D. 1571." London: William Serres.

themselves had so considerably benefited in things temporal, were, by other people who wished to try their hands at a like game, voted to be totally inadequate to the grave necessities of the times; so that fresh and wider changes were by consequence ruthlessly inaugurated. Faith and stability had vanished, though Sentiment and Opinion sometimes secured a hearing amid the disputes of controversialists and the profane and ponderous cant of hysterical preachers. But Peace and Unity—twin sisters of a divine corporation endowed with God's Holy Spirit—had been duly and efficiently banished from the realm. In their place the confusion of Babel and an excruciating discord as of combative demoniacs rose on all sides.

Some of these hysterical preachers—"Gospelers," as they were now called, or "ministers," (though the fact has too often been ignored,)—were mere tinkers; some were tailors, who believed themselves to be "inspired"; others farm labourers, such as ditchers, hedgers, or ploughmen, who thought themselves "called"; a few had probably been admitted, in some mode or another, to the office of *Lector* or reader; on which authority, as it appears, they presumed to baptize, to celebrate the Lord's Supper, and to marry couples. Discipline had long been flung to the winds. As such ministers only received a miserable pittance

for their "labours in the Gospel," and as most of them were married, they took to trading—buying and selling, in order to keep body and soul together, to feed their wives and children, and thus to keep the wolf from the door. The bishops, who were better housed, fed, and paid, did not approve of all this, but by their lordships' Injunctions and Visitation Articles* condemned the traders; and, though they hated and persecuted "the greased varlets of Antichrist," † as they termed the old priests, they could not exactly sanction the ministrations of vulgar and unordained adventurers from "the lowest of the people."

During the whole of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, it may be here properly pointed out, the loosest notions regarding the importance and value of ordinations prevailed almost universally. The old Catholic doctrine, with the ancient Ordi-

* "Whether your minister ordereth the course of his life answerable to his vocation, or useth buying and selling or trading or tinkering or tailoring, or to hedge, ditch, or go to plough; or hath solicited other men's visits for gaine, or hath employed himself about other such business not beseeming or fitting his calling?"—"Articles of Enquiry," of Cocks, Bishop of Ely, A.D. 1566. "*Item*, whether that any reader being admitted but to reade, taketh upon him to baptize, to marry, to celebrate the Lord's Supper, or to distribute the Lord's cup."—"Injunctions of Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich." London: John Day. 1561.

† Arnoldus Raissius, quoted by Austin Allfield in his "Answer to *Justitia Britannica*," cap. iii. p. 103.

nals, having been abolished, the necessity of imposition of hands with corresponding "form" * gave place to a notion that what alone was truly necessary to the making either of an overseer or a minister, was a call from the congregation whose servant he was then to become. Hence, in the tractates published and in the discussions which arose, this "call" became the leading feature in the making of ministers. Superadded ceremonies were held to be ornamental and politic, but not in any way essential. In fact no Church-of-England controversialist whatsoever of that reign can be found who maintained plainly and categorically the present doctrine of the Established Church on the subject; nor was it until the year 1597, when Richard Bancroft was "called" to be Bishop of London, that any practical attempt was made to reach any higher theological level than that which most of the Zwinglians, Calvinists, and Establishmentarians, regarded as perfectly scriptural, secure, and true. When this prelate was in 1604 elevated to the See of Canterbury, he succeeded in stemming the further progress of such lax teaching; for, pressed as the Establishmentarians had been by so many able

* This word is of course here used in its technical and theological sense. The "form" and "matter" of ordination own a special meaning.

defenders of the ancient faith, it was found that no defence of the polity of the new Church could be efficiently made in which the necessity of valid ordination, independent of any "call," or supposed "call," was not plainly and systematically asserted as essential to validity and value.

As regards the character of divine service, it was universally meagre in the extreme. The Reformation advocates were sorely offended at what little of ancient order and decency had been deliberately retained—the surplice, organs, and the observance of holy days; so that several of them, and some of these in high positions, declined to participate in services at which such practices were adopted. For example, Peter Martyr, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, declared, "As to myself, when I was at Oxford, I would never wear the surplice in the choir, although I was a canon, and I had my own reasons for doing so."* John Jewell,—who was never more fitly or aptly described than when the late Mr. Richard Hurrell Froude termed him "an irreverent Dissenter,"—when writing to this said Protestant Canon of Oxford, remarked that "the scenic apparatus of divine worship is now under agitation; and those very things which

* "Zurich Letters," 2nd Series, No. 14.—Parker Society's Publications.

you and I have so often laughed at, are now seriously and solemnly entertained by certain persons (for we are not consulted); as if the Christian religion could not exist without something tawdry.”* It was this person, subsequently made a bishop, who put himself forward, or was put forward by others, to defend by his pen the new National Church which had been set up by Parliament; and a laboured, tortuous, and poor apology and defence he made of it, as the numerous and forcible replies to his treatise sufficiently prove. The language of Richard Cocks, Bishop of Ely, still further shows the true character of certain of these miserable innovators:—“We are only constrained,” he writes, “to our great distress of mind, to tolerate in our churches the image of the cross, and Him Who was crucified: the Lord must be entreated that this stumbling-block may at length be removed.”† In 1563, Edwin Sandys, then Bishop of Worcester, petitioned the Convocation of Canterbury to supplicate the Head of the Church—by which he meant the Queen—“that all curious singing and playing of the organs may be removed”; while two other prelates, Grindal and Robert Horne, in a

* “Zurich Letters,” 1st Series, No. 9.—Parker Society’s Publications.

† “Zurich Letters,” 1st Series, No. 28.

letter to their foreign ally, Bullinger, who appears to have been greatly exercised in his mind that such eminent English gospellers should appear to tolerate these superstitions, thus plainly declared their private convictions: "We do not assert that the chanting in churches, together with the organ, is to be retained." Nothing of the sort was their real wish. They desired that the prayers, if said at all, should be preached or pronounced to the people; while, as to Popish chanting, they write, "We disapprove of it, as we ought to do."* This same person, Edmund Sandys, proposed in Convocation, "That all saints' feasts and holy days bearing the name of a creature, may, as tending to superstition, . . . be clearly abrogated."† On the other hand, certain of these cringing fanatics and heretical preachers having abolished the chief feasts of the Mother of God—though some of them were restored, for very shame's sake, about a hundred years later—had no scruple whatsoever in profanely making Queen Elizabeth's birthday a new feast of the first importance, equal to those of Christmas or Ascension Day; of singing invocations of Her Majesty, commencing *Ave Eliza!* in

* "Zurich Letters," 1st Series, No. 75.

† Wilkins' "Concilia," vol. iv. p. 239.

St. Paul's Cathedral, instead of the ancient and beautiful *Angelus Domini*, or the antiphons which often followed evensong; or of placing her portrait and coat-of-arms over the chancel-arch of certain churches. The Erastianism and wickedness of such innovations will be now frankly acknowledged by all Christian people.*

What they had produced throughout the country may be readily enough gathered from the books and tracts of the day, copies of which can still be studied. Irreligion and Indifference, twin giants of Evil, stalked unopposed throughout the land. Even some of the highest officials were startled at the sharp and striking results of their own deplorable handiwork; verily standing aghast at the existing desolation and demoralization. They had succeeded in overturning one religion—that which St. Augustine brought from the sacred city of Rome ten centuries before—and hundreds of

* See Wilkins' "Concilia," vol. iv. p. 239; Edward Rishton's continuation of "Sander's History," Book iv. chap. vi.; a paper by Dr. Rimbault on "Music of the Reformation Period"; Grindal's "Remains," Parker Society's edition, *in loco*; and Nichol's "Progresses of Queen Elizabeth." At Ricot Chapel, Oxfordshire, there was anciently a portrait of this Queen placed exactly over the Communion table; but when the adjoining mansion, "Ricot House," was pulled down, this picture is said to have been taken to Wytham, near Oxford, the present seat of the Earl of Abingdon.

thousands deplored its overthrow: they had set up another, recently made by the Queen and Parliament, which the people, knowing its origin and authorship, looked upon both with aversion and contempt.

To suppose that the main body of the baptized desired any such change is a fond and false notion, without historical sanction, and in the teeth of numerous batches of evidence to the direct contrary. The churches, bare and barn-like, were in fact, almost deserted.* The preachers often addressed only their own families and the whitewashed walls. The old religion the poor could understand; but they preferred the quiet pleasures of the ale-house to the dismal doctrines of John Calvin and the noise of his disciples.

Let a writer on behalf of the ancient faith state his position and judgment of what had been done:—"This manner of ministration of sacraments set forth in the Book of Common Prayers

* "Come into a church on the Sabbath Day, and ye shall see but few, though there be a sermon; but the ale-house is ever full. . . . A Popish summoner, spy or promoter, will drive more to the church with a word to hear a Latin Mass, than seven preachers will bring in a week's preaching to hear a godly sermon."—Bishop James Pilkington's Preface to his "Commentary on the Prophet Aggeus.—Works," p. 6. Parker Society. London: 1842.

was never allowed nor agreed upon by the Universal Church of Christ in any General Council or Sacred Synod; no, not by the clergy of England at the last Parliament; but only it was agreed upon by the laity, which have nothing ado with spiritual matters or causes of religion, but ought to stand to the decrees, judgment, and determination of the clergy in causes of Faith and Religion.”*

Again, let the same writer point out what was the impression in his own day as to the substitution of a table for an altar, and as to the intentional absence—for, to use a modern phrase, “omission was prohibition”—of any act of consecration in the new and chopped-up service of the Supper:—

“The Catholic Church, which we professed at our baptism to believe [in] and obey, teacheth us to receive Christ’s Body consecrate at Holy Mass with prayers, invocations, and benediction with the sign of the Holy Cross; and not bare bread and wine without consecration and benediction as is used in this Communion, being against the decrees and ordinance of Christ’s Catholic Church. Almighty God does command us to separate ourselves from such as take in hand a

* “Certain Questions Propounded,” &c. London: 1564.

ministration of sacraments against the ordinance of Christ's Church, and that ye touch nothing pertaining to them, lest ye be lapped in their sin."*

These statements are clear enough. The writer honestly urged all his readers not to participate in the heresies† and blasphemy of the innovators. Whatever else such charitable warnings serve to show, they certainly prove that some at least were true to the Faith of their forefathers.

On the other side let the varied words of an eminent innovator and Protestant Prince Palatine, Bishop Pilkington of Durham, be studied. He spoke with authority, even the authority of his Supreme Mistress, Queen Elizabeth, whom he obsequiously maintained‡ had rightly all spiritual

* "Certain Questions Propounded," &c. London: 1564.

† The following is a specimen of the anti-religious poetry of the Elizabethan æra:—

" O presumptious undertaker,
 Never cake could make a baker,
 Yet a Preist would make his Maker.
 What's become of all ye Christs ye preists have made?
 Do those hosts of Hosts abide, or do they fade?
 One Christ binds, ye rest doe flie;
 One's a truth, the rest's a lie."

MS., in quarto, in the library of the Rev. E. Higgins, of Bosbury House, Herefordshire,—the Common-place Book of the Lady Elizabeth Cope.

‡ "As I noted before, so it is not to be lightly considered, that, where so often the Prophet here rehearseth the names

pre-eminence, even over patriarchs and popes :—
 “ In the restoring of the Gospel many weep when they see not the churches so well decked and furnished as before. The Pope’s church hath all things pleasant in it to delight the people withal ; as for the eyes, their God hangs on a rope [*i.e.* in the pyx or *ciborium*], images gilded, painted, carved most finely, copes, chalices, crosses of gold and silver, banners, &c., with relics and altars ; for the ears, singing, ringing, and organs piping ; for the nose, frankincense sweet ; to wash away sins (as they say), holy water of their own hallowing and making ; priests an infinite sort ; masses, trentals, diriges, and pardons, &c. But where the Gospel is preached, they knowing that God is not pleased but only with a pure heart, they are content with an honest place appointed to resort together in, though it were never hallowed by bishop at all ; but have only a pulpit, a preacher to the people, a deacon for the poor, a table for the Communion, with bare walls, or else written

of Zerubabel and Joshua, the two chiefest rulers ; yet he evermore setteth in order the Civil Magistrate and Power before the Chief Priest, to signify the pre-eminence and preferment that he hath in the commonwealth and other matters, more than the Chief Priest (by what name soever he be called), whether it be the pope, archbishop, or metropolitan.”
 —“*Aggeus and Abdias*,” by James Pilkington, chap. i. London: W. Serres, 1562.

with scriptures, having God's eternal word sounding always amongst them in their sight and ears."*

Again, as regards the contrast between the Old and the New:—

“For when thou comest to Communion with the Papists, and according to St. Paul would ‘eat of that bread and drink of that cup,’ they will neither give thee bread nor wine according to Christ’s institution (for they say the substance is changed and there remaineth no bread); but they will give thee an idol of their own making, which they call their God. They come not together, according unto Christ’s rule, to break the bread; but they creep into a corner, as the Pope teaches them, to sacrifice for the quick and the dead, to sell heaven, to harrow [*i.e.* to plunder] hell, and sweep purgatory of all such as will pay. They come not to communicate with the people, but to eat up all alone.”

No words could possibly set forth the actual position of the innovators more exactly and correctly. Yet, it is clear that the people cared not for the recent inventions in religion; on the con-

* Bishop Pilkington’s “Aggeus and Abdias.” London: W. Serres, 1562.

† Bishop Pilkington’s “Exposition upon the Prophets,” &c., pp. 171, 172.—Parker Society. London: 1842.

trary, being earnestly and heartily attached to the One True Faith, they disliked them.

Pilkington, by consequence, goes on to grumble because the desecrated and deserted churches were despised and neglected by the populace, as they deserved to be; and to complain of the people because they did not appreciate the alternate preaching and reading, reading and preaching, so wordy, tedious, and uninteresting, of the restless innovators. Then, as now, many affirmed that they themselves could read quite as profitably, if not more so, at home:—

“Let us be ashamed, then, of those lewd sayings, ‘What should I do at the church? I may not have my beads; the church is like a waste-barn; there is (*sic*) no images nor saints to worship and make curtsy unto; little God-in-the-box is gone (!!); there is nothing but a little reading and preaching, that I cannot tell what it means. I had as lief keep me at home.’”*

About this period, the Bible and the newly-revised Prayer Book—already altered three times since 1549—were ordered to be translated into Welsh, for use in the Principality of Wales, where the people knew little or nothing of English; though they could follow well enough, and join

* “Aggeus and Abdias.”—London: W. Serres, 1562.

in, the ancient Latin services of the Western Church. The Rosary they knew, and the Litany of the Saints, and the *Angelus*, which they recited three times a day. But these new translations effected little good.

As we all know, the Established Church in Wales has turned out a complete failure. Foes assert it, friends admit it. What religion still remains is of a dissenting type.

Englishmen not knowing the language and customs of the Welsh people, have been too often appointed to the highest offices in that communion. Both deans and bishops have frequently been merely common-place aliens. So that prelates, rewarded for political services, or younger sons of impoverished noblemen, have been chiefly distinguished—and it is no mean worldly advantage—for the fruitfulness of their wives, the size of their families, the excellence of their wine, and the large sums of money left to their English survivors by testamentary bequests at their unmourned decease.

The cathedrals, until quite lately, had long lain in partial ruin. The snows of winter and the sunshine of summer alternately fell on the floors of unroofed chantries and desecrated chapels, where a few chipped and cast-down altars and battered monuments, slowly crumbling to decay, told of a worship that had been long ago cast

out, and of Catholic families long gone to their rest and become extinct. The cathedral choir—musty in its atmosphere, and gloomy in its aspect, with no scrap of colour throughout it from floor to roof, except maybe the crimson stair-carpet of its lofty pulpit, or the velvet cushion for the dean's elbows—may have been used as a preaching-place once a week; and perhaps for the Lord's Supper, travestied by some ministerial sloven, once a quarter. Otherwise it stood only as an impressive monument of a cast-out Faith; and as an actual reminder to the more thoughtful of the impotence of reforms and revolutions to benefit a Christian population. In the chief Welsh towns at the present day, the Establishment can scarcely hold its own; while in the villages too many of the antique barn-like churches, so cold, desolate, and unused, green with damp and rot, and sometimes not even paved, are not unfrequently practically empty. In the disastrous principles of Reform and Change there was obviously no finality. If one set of men might mend, mar, and muddle,—why not the restless, the self-seeking, and the revolutionary of every succeeding generation?

So great was the confusion existing, so perplexing were the discords of controversialists; while cross-purposes, the sowing of political discord in foreign nations, and an universal upheav-

ing of opinion, popular with self-seekers and reformers, were so common that the wisest were most anxious for the close and consequences of the Council of Trent.

Here it may be incidentally, but not inappropriately noticed, with regard to General Councils, that the sublime doctrines of the Christian Religion have been duly developed in a certain historical sequence, parallel to the order in which they are set forth in the Creeds. Thus the true doctrine of the adorable Trinity chiefly occupied the two first Œcumenical Councils; the four next—those of Ephesus, Chalcedon, the Second and Third of Constantinople—were engaged in expressing with unerring exactness the faith concerning the Incarnation; while the first indirect definition regarding the Holy Eucharist was made by the seventh Œcumenical Council, the Second of Nicæa. The subjects of grace and of the sacraments in general, of man's free will and justification, were treated and settled, once for all, by the Council of Trent. Later questions, mainly rationalistic, relating to the true nature of the Church, the office and work of the Holy Ghost, His Divine indwelling, and the infallibility and indefectibility of the Kingdom of the World's Redeemer, have been treated more recently. The rationalism of the present day, in which the very existence of God has been denied,

and the evils which flow from such rationalism—Erastianism, godless education, and nationalism in religion—are the great subjects which quite recently have been authoritatively condemned.

On the 3rd and 4th of December, 1563, the last session of the sacred Council of Trent was held. It had been in abeyance for the greater part of the time since its first assembling on the 13th of December 1545. Pope Paul III. and Pope Julius III. had in due course guided its decisions and decrees, but during its sessions had passed to their reward. Its work, from beginning to end, was one of true, honest, and legitimate reform. The lawful rulers of the Western Church—duly and painfully considering all heresies, schisms, defects, innovations, and errors, and more especially those modern “reforms” which had become so disastrously current amongst the Northern races—carefully amended whatever needed amendment, and this in no ambiguous terms. Its Catechism, Canons, Decrees, and Confession of Faith remain consequently as monuments of the consummate wisdom of its members, and as certain tokens of the guiding Presence of the Divine Paraclete, with the Patriarch of Christendom, the cardinals and prelates.

The close of the Council was impressive indeed. First, all things that had been duly done for the

progress of the Church and the benefit of the faithful, were solemnly confirmed by those present in the presence of the Blessed and Adorable Sacrament. To the then Pontiff, Pius IV., the members of the Council wished many years and eternal memory. Peace from the Lord God, everlasting glory and eternal happiness in the sight of the Saints, were asked for on behalf of the two departed Popes who had reigned during the Council's previous sessions. For the Emperors Charles V. and Ferdinand, and for all Christian kings, "preservers of the right faith," the members of the Council prayed God to bestow many years of life. Prayers went up to the Almighty, likewise, for the legates, the cardinals, and the bishops. The Faith of the Church, as newly explained, was confessed by all, and promises openly made to keep the Council's Decrees. "We all thus believe," they affirmed. "We all think the very same thing; we all, consenting and embracing both Creed and Decrees, voluntarily subscribe thereto. This," they went on to declare, "is the Faith of blessed Peter and of the Apostles; this is the Faith of our fathers, this we believe, this we hold, to this we adhibit our names."

Then the Cardinal of Lorraine, arising uncovered, declared as follows:—"Adhering to these Decrees, may we be rendered worthy of the

grace and mercy of the First and Great High Priest, Jesus Christ, Our Lord and God; Our Immaculate Lady, the Holy Mother of God; and all the Saints interceding for us."

"Amen; so be it!" was the unanimous and universal response.

"To all heretics," continued His Eminence, "be anathema."

"Amen!" was the like hearty and unanimous answer.

Then, after having sung *Te Deum*, the members dispersed. Such was the Council's impressive and solemn close.

In England what had been effected was at once seen to be of the gravest and greatest importance. Independent of the discussions concerning doctrines, the very practical point of occasional conformity with the new religion and worship, which certain Englishmen had followed, was fearlessly dealt with; while those who had occasionally frequented the churches were distinctly forbidden to do so any longer.

Immediately this decision was formally proclaimed a change came over those who clung to the ancient faith. Reports of the terms in which the decision had been given reached England in due course, some months before the formal decree. An authority hitherto recognized by all the Christian nations of the West, the Chief Patriarch of

the Church of God, now spoke. His words were reverently listened to; the old law of Christianity, newly applied, was at once dutifully heard and duly obeyed.

Much suffering followed upon obedience; but it sanctified the sufferers, and abundantly blessed them all, during the anxious and trying time of their earthly probation.

CHAPTER III.

THIS decision of the Council of Trent, as will soon be discovered, exercised great influence on the course of events in England. But these must not be forestalled. The exact point and purport of that decision were not publicly made known by the issue of any formal document; but the duty of those who retained the old Faith soon became perfectly well understood.

Hence, more completely and generally than ever, the churches, and specially the more remote and village churches, became deserted.* This fact is on record again and again in the writings of the Fathers of the so-called "Reformation."

* In some of the towns, pre-arranged theological controversies and squabbles over the meaning of Scripture, enlivened the ordinary dulness, when bull- or badger-baiting were out of season.

The new prelates deplored the emptiness of the sacred edifices in writing to each other. Some of them, furthermore, grumblingly complained to Sir William Cecil; but if the existing fines for absence and for non-participation in the new "rites of the Supper" would not aid in filling the desecrated sanctuaries, that statesman, as he responded, was unable as yet to suggest any more efficient practical remedy. The bishops should more painfully and piously give themselves to preaching and prayer. They should be "less with your women and children, and more with your flocks,"* as an anonymous writer forcibly remarked.

The division, therefore, between the ancient Catholics and the upholders of the new religion became still further marked and manifest; while the State Powers thus confessed themselves impotent either to bridge over the newly-made chasm, or to prevent further rents and fissures being deliberately made by those standing on its brink.

Ere we pass on to the deeds of later years, it is necessary to deal here with a few events and positions of some importance.

The state of Ecclesiastical affairs, about the year 1564, more especially the frightful confusion

* "A Modest Cure, together with a Cry from the Wilderness," &c., pp. 35, 36. London: 1566.

everywhere practically existing, and in some places rampant—quite worthy of note—is sufficiently proved from a record still remaining in Sir William Cecil's own handwriting.* It was evidently made after due and careful inquiry on the part of that influential state official. As regards the performance of divine service and the administration of those sacraments which were retained,—Cecil's own expressive sentences are scarcely altered in what is about to be reproduced, and, where altered, only paraphrased in what now immediately follows:—

Some of the ministers say the service and prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the church. Some say the same in a seat made in the church; others in the pulpit, with their faces to the people. Some keep precisely the order of the new Prayer Book, others introduce metrical psalms; some use a surplice at prayers, while others minister in their secular and ordinary attire—hat, doublet, and hose. As regards the position of the Communion table, in certain places it stands in the body of the church, in others in the choir. Within the latter it is sometimes placed altar-wise about a yard from the east wall; in other cases it stands in the midst of the

* See vol. iii., No. 7, of the Lansdowne MSS. in the British Museum.

chancel north and south. In some places it consists of a table duly constructed in joiner's work, in others it is a mere rough board placed upon common trestles. By some of the new ministers it is covered with a carpet or an old vestment; by others the bare oak table is intentionally left perfectly exposed and uncovered. In the actual administration of the Communion, ordered to take place once a month, some of the cathedral clergy and the Queen's chaplains ministered the ordinance in a surplice with a cope over it; others were clad in a surplice only; others, again, with no official dress of any sort or kind. Uniformity was thus out of the question, as those discovered, who, with unbridled self-pleasing, and license, having altered the ancient services to suit their own tastes and opinions, found it exceedingly hard to induce others to adopt exactly the same standard of ecclesiastical taste, though prescribed by Injunction or Proclamation. So it was, likewise, as regards details. Some used an ancient chalice and paten at the table, others a communion cup of the new sort, others a common cup. The Bread, either leavened or unleavened, was received by some kneeling, by others standing, by some walking round the table,* by others sitting,

* "They used to begin with three or four sermons, preached one after the other. They then went to Communion, not

by many with their heads covered. All thus pleased themselves, while Discord reigned. Again: at baptism some ministers administered the sacrament at the font, others in a basin; some with a surplice, others without; some drew the sign of the cross on the child's brow; others, with an honest shudder at the very notion, deliberately omitted it as the acknowledged "mark of the Apocalyptic Beast."

This new religion, so eminently selfish, which Cecil and Elizabeth had set up, had given point to the well-known foreign Protestant maxim—"Every one for himself, and God for us all." The poor, therefore (now so haggard and famishing), whom the Divine Author of Christianity had declared that His followers should always have with them, were voted an eye-sore and a nuisance.

When, consequently, the Queen, in her royal progresses, passed through different districts of this once-favoured land, she could not fail to observe the miserable condition of the lean and famishing peasantry, who came out from their hovels to stare sullenly at her as she was borne along on her velvet-dressed litter. Ill-fed, half-clothed,

receiving it either on their knees or standing, but moving by, so that it might be called a Passover in very truth."—"Life of William Weston," p. 241. London: 1875.

lantern-jawed and wolf-like, with scarcely any rights left, with no protectors against tyranny from above or grinding cruelty from below (for the new nobles and the local constables equally oppressed them), those few who were old enough to remember a former state of things may have been pardoned if they felt disposed to curse the day upon which they had been born.

During the whole of her reign, in truth, the state of the lower classes was appallingly sad, and their destitution deplorable. The monasteries having long ago been destroyed, or put to secular purposes, and their ample revenues given away to worthless adventurers as bribes; and these revenues too often lost, squandered, and dissipated by those who had by law sacrilegiously taken possession of such sacred possessions and their corresponding treasures,—the country poor suffered severely. No moral consideration could induce the new owners of the monastic estates to aid in relieving or maintaining the indigent and aged people, who bore in patience their poverty and woes. No doubt these estates were grievously impoverished, and produced but little; for, as a rule, (the times being times of change,) they were neither cultivated so well, nor looked after so carefully, as when the monks owned a life-interest in them. Too often the new secular proprietors

were tyrants, oppressive usurers, cold-hearted, and godless.

Our Divine Redeemer, as all Christians know, has left here upon earth the poor, the unfortunate, and the miserable—a beautiful necessity—to become objects of the love and care of those who have received temporal blessings and the riches of this world. Like a refreshing shower during sunshine, He has caused to descend upon them a double portion of His divine charity—the graces of Calvary and the glories of Tabor. Withdrawing Himself awhile during man's time of probation, He has thus bequeathed the poverty-stricken to us. They are at once His liveliest image and His best-loved inheritance. But under Queen Elizabeth they were neglected, despised, and passed by. For faith was cold and charity was not.

On the occasion of the Queen's visit to Cambridge, she went in state, on a Sunday morning in August 1564, to King's College Chapel, to hear a Latin sermon by Dr. Perne, prefaced by the Bidding Prayer. Prior to this, the Litany in English was sung, during which she entered with a combination of regal and pontifical splendour. Four doctors of divinity carried a canopy of cloth-of-gold over the Supreme Governess—the same canopy which, in the fourth year of her sister's reign, had been borne over the Blessed Sacrament

by four knights in the same chapel; and she was attended by her ladies in waiting and high officers of state,—some of whom carried those external symbols of Her Highness's spiritual and ecclesiastical authority which she had assumed, and desired never should be wanting on such occasions. The Queen approved of the sermon; and "liked the singing of the choir so well," that she attended Evensong in the afternoon, on which occasion some lyrical verses in her honour, parodying one of the ancient antiphons of Our Lady with which the Sunday Vespers had been formerly concluded, were sung. It had been arranged that one of the plays of Plautus—the "Aularia"—should be represented in the hall of King's College on Sunday evening; but as the space of that refectory was limited, and there was not sufficient room to erect a suitable state-throne and canopy for the Queen, Her Majesty gave orders that a stage should be put up and that the play should be acted in the chapel, which was done, and the performance was not concluded until midnight. The Queen was so pleased with the acting, but more particularly with the good looks, of a handsome youth who had very cleverly personified Dido, that on that sultry autumn midnight she at once sent for him to her apartments at King's College, to speak to him and to commend him to his face; and, when she left the University, she

graciously bestowed an annual benefaction of twenty pounds per annum for life upon this favoured and lucky performer.* It will thus be seen that the revived taste for pagan literature had at this time become so rampant, as that a chapel dedicated to the solemn worship of God the Trinity was, by royal command, thus deliberately profaned.

By her numerous love affairs—for she was always in love, ever making plans for matrimony—she contrived to make herself the scandal of England and the laughing-stock of the European Courts. Details of her personal behaviour when her favourites were concerned, often so unwomanly and disgusting, of her coarse words and questionable sayings, were, in open letters or by occult cypher, transmitted by the clever ambassadors from abroad to their various royal and imperial masters; who were thus kept well and truly informed of what was actually going on, and who, on reading them, grinned over such records of her amorous antics.

* The authorities at Cambridge seem to have been exceedingly annoyed, if not greatly disgusted, at her parsimony and favoritism. On leaving she simply thanked them for their hospitality, and gave some of the Heads of Houses her right hand to kiss. A "Copie of verses" then penned and printed,—commenting on her gift to the youthful actor, and hinting that the said gift was a reward for questionable favours,—too coarse to transcribe, is preserved there.

The first of her lovers was a knight of a respectable family, Sir William Pickering, of whom John Jewell informed Bullinger that he was "both a prudent and pious man." Sir William had been sent on a mission to one of the petty princes of Germany, and on his return the Queen, suddenly smitten, heaped such favours on him, and paid him such unusual attention, both at proper and improper times, that the courtiers quite believed that a marriage would (or at all events, after what had happened, that it *should*) take place. Pickering was undoubtedly handsome, with a fine brow, regular features, and small hands and feet; his address, moreover, was courtly, his tastes were refined. Whether, on discovering the amatory peculiarities of the Supreme Governess, and her expectations, he became both alarmed and disgusted, or not, may never be accurately known. Anyhow, the affair all at once collapsed—no one knew why or wherefore—and this as suddenly as it had been initiated.

Her next lover was Henry, Earl of Arundel, K.G., born in 1512, at heart a staunch supporter of the ancient faith, a brave soldier,* and one who on several occasions had done good service

* He had distinguished himself greatly by his bravery at the siege of Boulogne.

to the state. In Edward VI.'s reign he had been unjustly and heavily fined upon frivolous pretences; but his noblest achievement was to have peaceably secured the throne to the late pious and religious Queen Mary. He it was who proclaimed her in the City and then rode down to Suffolk to receive her commands and serve her well. But this unhappy nobleman, in order to please the new Queen, had voted in the House of Lords, against the convictions of his conscience, in favour of the so-called "Reformation" and the new laws, and kept up an appearance of maintaining it. A member of the old nobility, for he was the eighteenth earl of his house and name, he was munificent and even regal in his choice offerings and rich gifts to his Sovereign, and often entertained her with masques, banquets, and balls. In fact his vast fortune had proved wholly inadequate to pay for the expenses he had thus incurred, and he greatly impoverished his estates by so doing. At length, irritated by the Queen's behaviour, he haughtily returned his staff of office as Lord Steward, with some over-plain and too homely words of warning and expostulation. Later on, however, he opposed the Court party (disliking the Queen's projected marriage with the Duke of Anjou), and, being by them feared, was soon persecuted. When he could no longer minister to the Queen's amuse-

ment, evinced independence, and was growing old and gouty,* she speedily turned her attention to younger and livelier favourites; and not only treated the Earl with contempt, but with great harshness. He died in 1580.†

The person who made the deepest impression on her heart was a worthless fellow of neither family nor blood, Lord Robert Dudley. He, with his father the Duke of Northumberland, the low-born son of the rapacious usurer of Henry VIII.'s reign, had been attainted for the attempt to remove both Mary and Elizabeth from the succession to the crown. But he had recently been restored in blood, received several official appointments and grants, and met with great favour from the Queen herself.‡ He was appointed

* In 1565 he went to try the effects of the baths at Padua for relief from the gout in his feet, but with no great success. "He had been made her tool in politics and her sport in secret," writes Miss Strickland.

† "In him," wrote Camden, "was extinct the surname of this most noble family, which had flourished with great honour for three hundred years and more; from the time of Richard Fitz-alan, who, being descended from the Albinis, ancient Earls of Arundel and Sussex, in the reign of Edward I. received the title of Earl without any creation, in regard of his being possessed of the castle and honour of Arundel."

‡ In the fifth year of her reign she granted Robert Dudley the castle and manor of Kenilworth and Astel Grove, the lordships and manors of Denbigh and Chirk, with other lands and possessions, together with a special license for transporting cloth, which he disposed of to John Mark and

Master of the Horse, with a fee of one hundred marks a year, and, to the astonishment both of the peers and the public, made a Knight of the Garter, and soon afterwards Constable of Windsor Castle. On September 29th, 1563, he was created Baron of Denbigh and Earl of Leicester. This took place with great state at Westminster, as Sir James Melville, who was present, has left on record. The Queen, in her chair of state, personally invested Robert Dudley with the new robes of his dignities as he knelt before her. During the trying process, many eyes being upon him, he bore himself with due gravity and discretion; for several peers, officers of state, and foreign ambassadors were present. Before the new peer arose, however, the amorous Queen had the execrable taste to tickle him in the neck underneath his linen shirt, at which he crimsoned deeply; and afterwards, with smirks and smiles of satisfaction, to ask Melville, the Scotch Ambassador, what he thought of the Earl's person and bearing.*

others, merchant adventurers.—See “The Sidney Papers,” *in loco*, and the grant of the peerage for life to Alice Dudley (wife of Sir Robert Dudley, son of the Earl of Leicester), as Duchess of Dudley, by King Charles I.

* A very fine miniature of this nobleman, from the pencil of Isaac Oliver (1556–1617), is in the possession of the Duke

Elizabeth had evidently pressed a marriage between Mary, Queen of Scots, and Lord Leicester, in order that when the former refused him, as was sure to be the case, the way might be more easily opened for the completion of her own matrimonial arrangements with the new nobleman. Should Mary accept him—which was highly improbable—it would not be difficult for Elizabeth to bring the proposal to nought, and then secure the man for herself.

There was at one time a coolness between the Queen and Leicester, which the latter cleverly turned to his own account, and made use of in the following manner. Holding that a temporary absence might serve his purpose, and whet Her Highness's appetite for his return and company, he resolved to ask to be sent to France on some diplomatic mission, and induced De Foys, the French Ambassador, to make this request in person of the Queen. On hearing it she flew into a passion, swore her usual oath, and at once ordered Leicester into her presence to offer some explanation of his unexpected desire.

The Earl came in due course, when she immediately asked him if it were possible that he truly

wished to go to France. "I will have it," she said, "from thine own lips, if so it be." He replied, with unusual calmness, "With your Highness's permission and favour, it is one of the several things I most desire."

The Queen was so nettled by this quiet response that she told him, with bitterness, that it would be no great honour to send a groom (this was a sarcastic allusion to his office of Master of the Horse) to so great and puissant a prince as the French King.

He is said to have been made intensely indignant by this studied insult, and to have changed colour greatly. But he kept his temper and wisely restrained his speech.

When he had retired from her presence, which he did at once, she laughingly observed to the Ambassador—"I cannot live, believe me, I cannot live without a sight of that man daily. He is like my lap-dog. When that is seen running forward, they who see it say that I, his mistress, am nigh. And so it is. Where my Lord of Leicester is, there too am I; there, good de Foys, must I be likewise."

Soon afterwards fresh warmth, not to write heat, took the place of the temporary coolness which had existed between the Queen and her favourite; while, as a consequence of their becoming inseparable companions, once more the

case, fresh scandalous reports were current at home, while abroad it was openly asserted that they lived in adulterous intercourse.*

On one occasion Elizabeth had condescended to discuss these reports with Quadra, the Spanish Ambassador. In so doing the poor lady surely forgot both her dignity as a queen and her delicacy as a woman, in personally and argumentatively pointing out the *à priori* improbability of what was asserted by her enemies, by a joint inspection of her own and her favourite's sleeping-chambers, and their due geographical relation to each other. This unpleasant incident, which, it is to be feared, altogether failed of its purpose, was discussed by some of the other ambassadors, and, as usual, also talked about abroad.

Subsequently the Queen, finding that her favourite's health was likely to suffer from the alleged dampness of the room in which he had hitherto slept, had the daring indelicacy to assign him a chamber in close proximity to the royal sleeping-apartment.† The boldness of this act

* A gentleman in Norfolk was put upon his trial for having asserted that "my Lord of Leicester had two children by the Queen," and for this plain-speaking was compelled to lose both his ears or else to pay a fine of £100.—See "Lodge," vol. ii. p. 47.

† Testimony of Quadra, Bishop of Aquila, in original despatches at Simancas.

quite astonished some of the more refined amongst the courtiers; while certain of the old nobility, though silent, shook their heads gravely at the mention of it. But no one publicly criticized or protested. Fortune in this, as in other cases, favoured the brave. Elizabeth, in these amorous contrivances, was truly as brave as she was bold, and, it may be added, as daring as she was indelicate and unblushing.

But more of this hereafter. Almost to the day of her death she was always seeking for the admiration of the other sex. As she grew in years, so she grew in vanity, selfishness, and cruelty—cruelty such as in a woman the World has seldom been called upon to contemplate and turn from in aversion.

Her treatment of the venerable Archbishop of York, Dr. Nicholas Heath, for example, was simply inhuman and scandalous. She had been deeply indebted to him, seven years previously, at a sore crisis in her life, the death of her half-sister Queen Mary, but seems to have speedily enough forgotten her obligation. He it was who, when her title to the throne was so doubtful, served by boldness and prompt action to establish her questionable position; for, like an apt statesman and loyal subject, he secured the sanction of both Houses of Parliament to the Proclamation by which her reign was peacefully

and duly inaugurated. Yet because, being "a Churchman of the true ancient sort," he was conscientiously unable to accept the ridiculous figment of her so-called "Supremacy," and, as in duty bound, resisted, both in the Houses of Lords and Convocation, the imposition of such a fraudulent novelty upon Englishmen, by every lawful means at hand, she had the Archbishop privately conveyed to the Tower, without charge or trial, and there for five weary years confined in a dark and unwholesome dungeon, to his great sorrow and pain.

When in ordinary conversation the Venetian Ambassador so properly put before the Queen the strong judgment entertained abroad of such unjustifiable acts of persecution and iniquity,—for, as he remarked in regard to the imprisoned Archbishop, "no man in a civilized State should be condemned to punishment without a hearing,"—she enjoined that Archbishop Heath was to be "less straitened." At that time, Thomas Young, an intruder, neither canonically elected, nor duly confirmed, had usurped the place and revenues of the ancient archiepiscopal see, legally belonging to Heath, and was doing his best to serve the cause of Cecil and the innovators in a loyal and beautiful county—the people of which were almost unanimously in favour of the Ancient Faith. Heath was therefore permitted to retire to the

Manor House in York,* formerly the residence of the Abbot of St. Mary's and subsequently one of the official houses of the see in question; and, though kept under a close watch, he was allowed to walk abroad within a certain distance of his place of confinement. But even this moderate liberty was looked upon by some with dislike and jealousy. The suspicions regarding this venerable prelate were, however, suspicions and nothing more; possibly the consequence of malice, or probably of mere gossip. In the meantime Lord Scrope† applied to the Council for advice and directions in the case of the Archbishop's suspected peregrinations. The question was discussed, in the Queen's presence, on the 22nd of June 1565, with the assistance of the Lord Keeper Bacon, the Marquis of Northampton, the Earl of

* Canon Raine, of York, thus most courteously writes to me:—"If the place is described as 'the Manor House in York,' it is the large building formerly the residence of the Abbot of St. Mary's and now the Yorkshire School for the Blind. It was generally called 'the Manor House' or 'the King's Manor,' as the Stuart kings resided there."

† This was Henry, ninth Lord Scrope of Bolton, K.G., summoned to Parliament from 21st October 1555, to 4th of February 1589. In the fifth year of Queen Elizabeth he was appointed Governor of the Castle of Carlisle and Warden of the West Marches. He married, first, Eleanor, daughter of Edward, Lord North, by whom he had an only daughter; and, secondly, the Lady Margaret Howard, sister of the Duke of Norfolk, by whom he had an only son Thomas, who became tenth Lord Scrope.

Leicester, Mr. Secretary Cecil, Mr. Cave, Mr. Petre, and Mr. Sackville; when it was determined that Lord Scrope should deal sharply and promptly with the old man of eighty, "to the end that he should declare the full truth why he wandereth abroad, and if he will not be plain in his declaration,"—the Queen, just turned thirty years of age, goes on to have "fully determined" and recorded on the Council Register that he must be tortured, pinched, or thumb-screwed,—“to use some kind of torture to him, so as to be without any great bodily hurt, and to advertise his (Lord Scrope's) doings herein,”* are the exact words of the Privy Council Order.

About this time, *i.e.* 1566, another controversy arose, not from maintainers of the old order of affairs, but from certain of the more advanced innovators. And it arose as follows:—

For the new bishops a lawn rochet and black chimere, with silk scarf, and neck-band of sable or other furs, was customarily adopted or enjoined to be worn. In existing pictures of them they are thus represented.† This was the ancient do-

* See, for the documents and authorities relating to this act of iniquitous cruelty, "Memorials of the Howards," edited by Mr. Howard, of Corby Castle.

† See a contemporary portrait of Matthew Parker in the dining-hall of Lambeth Palace.

mestic dress of a Western Catholic prelate—not a dress for public ministrations, but for hall or study—which he always used in private. But, as it seemed to mark off the chief superintendents from ordinary ministers, it gave great offence to the latter and their followers, more especially when they were violent Calvinists or rampant Zwinglians. Equality in the House of God was what was wanted by the innovators, with a complete banishment of all external signs, symbols, or “vestures of superstition,” as they were termed.

Anything more than the ordinary dress of the preachers was consequently held in horror. The same was the case with the use of the surplice and silken hood enjoined upon the inferior clergy. From the outset the foreign Protestants had rudely characterized the surplice as “the whore of Babylon’s chemise,” “the Romish ragge,” “Antichrist’s shyrte,” and by other equally choice terms. As early as 1550, however, John Hooper, an apostate Cistercian monk, who had been duly infected with the heresies of Geneva, had firmly refused to wear any such vestments, and had carried on a furious and angry controversy with Dr. Nicholas Ridley against them; while Miles Coverdale, a rough Yorkshireman, who had once been an Augustinian friar, but repudiated the Faith and become first a Lutheran and subsequently a Calvinistic heretic, was heartily at one

with Hooper in his practice; and was even obstinately vigorous and foul-mouthed in his anti-vestment frenzy. The extravagant violence of this old man's language, glanced at now, only raises a smile or a sincere feeling of pity.

This controversy, which obviously covered theological differences of a true and deep nature, grew rapidly in fierceness and fury.* The anti-vestment agitators pleaded for a "pure and plain" service, which, judging from contemporary statements on the subject, it might not unreasonably be presumed they had from their own standing-point already secured—for the churches had been largely emptied of their ornaments, wrecked of all that was valuable, and whitewashed. Still the innovators declined to attend any worship where surplice, rochet, or hood appeared on the backs of the ministers; and they expressed this their

* To add a few details as to facts:—The Puritans objected to the pre-eminence and authority of the bishops, and the jurisdiction of the episcopal courts. They disliked the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, as savouring of vain repetitions on Popish beads; they would not use the versicles and responses, which were, they maintained, too much like the "ancient idolatrie." The reading of the Apocrypha, the sign of the cross in baptism, the ring in marriage, and the terms of the marriage-contract, were equally distasteful. Chanting the psalms, the use of organs or musical instruments, and more especially the enjoined dresses of the clergy, were all signs or marks of the Beast.

settled determination in scurrilous pamphlets and the most violent speeches, as well as in action. Many of these were printed at private presses, some had been prepared abroad, others were issued without any publisher's name, so that no one could be held responsible for what they contained. All of them were wildly anti-episcopal, and full of abuse of the new Protestant bishops, who were characterized as "turncoats," "anti-Gospellers," and "traitors." The Master and Wardens of the Stationers' Company consequently were formally enjoined to search for and seize such works. Their authors were to be dealt with by the arbitrary Court of High Commission, which, managing by a side-wind to make laws as they seemed to be required, came down upon all Puritan offenders with sledge-hammer force. The recent "reforms" were asserted to be at once "godly" and "sufficient"; anything further was ruthlessly condemned. Furthermore, any book-dealer selling a copy of the offensive pamphlets in question was to be fined twenty shillings for each offence. The printer was to be imprisoned, while both printer and bookseller was each henceforward forbidden to follow his respective calling on any plea, at any time, in any case, or under any circumstances.

These tyrannical and contemptible enactments, which came fresh from the soiled hands of the

daring rebels who, without any authority, had pretended to "reform" the Church of God, and which enactments, it may be remarked, were quite worthy of their authors, utterly failed of their purpose. The Puritans continued to read, write, and publish most violent and obnoxious tractates; and, as a party, soon became distasteful and a source of grave danger to the Government.

These energetic persons who on principle, however false, objected to the "prelatical" and "Popish" character of the new Religion, soon secured for themselves the title of "Nonconformists." According to their consciences, (or what may have done duty for the same,) they could not and would not adhere to the system recently set up. They deliberately dissented from it; they could not conform to it, even though enjoined thereto by so high an authority as the Queen's Highness herself. Of course it was quite reasonable that any of the preaching ministers who adopted this policy should retire from work in the new state organization or religious institution—leave the pulpit and close the Book of Homilies. But this was not enough. Her Majesty's advisers went much further in their dealings with these unhappy people.* All Englishmen, as the

* In June of the year 1567 a congregation of more than a hundred Puritans was surprised and seized at Plumbers'

teaching then stood, must acknowledge the Queen's Supreme Headship, and worship exactly as she worshipped, bow when she bowed, pray as she prayed, sing as she sang, and in no other way. The ponderous preachments and dreary services of Geneva, which some miserable fanatics, stricken with self-delusion, looked upon as the highest types of evangelical purity, were consequently as much forbidden as the Hereford or Salisbury rite for Holy Mass. The so-called "prophesyings" of the Puritans were quite as odious to the Queen as the Catholic Sacraments of Confirmation and Extreme Unction, the Rosary or the Angelus. Such a practical policy scarcely befitted those who so loudly condemned the proceedings of the previous reign. And this point was more than once ably but unavailingly pressed upon the Queen by some of the official representatives of foreign courts. Yet, let the truth be told, it was only by persecution, fines, imprisonment, and the galleys, that the new system of nationalism in religion could be maintained at all.

About this time an ecclesiastical case of great importance—of such importance indeed as that

Hall, in the City of London, of which fifteen were marched off to prison without either charge, trial, or condemnation. After they had thus been treated they were examined by Grindal, the Bishop of London, who rated them fiercely, but failed to secure their conformity.

special legislation immediately took place because of it—was heard in the secular courts. Robert Horne, Bishop of Winchester, a Puritan gentleman of some zeal, indicted Dr. Bonner, the *de jure* but not *de facto* Bishop of London (for Edmund Grindal by royal authority had usurped that important position), for refusing to take the recent Oath of Supremacy. Bonner had been for years a close prisoner in the Marshalsea, and this place of confinement was in the diocese of Winchester. The plea which Bonner put in was a plain and bold one, viz. that Horne, falsely calling himself “Bishop of Winchester,” had never been duly, regularly, and legally consecrated according to the laws of the Church of England; and consequently that he could not be, and was not, bishop of the diocese in which Bonner was confined, and therefore had no legal authority whatsoever to tender him the oath in question. It was a bold move on the part of the closely-imprisoned and ill-treated prelate; but, being founded on fact and law, turned out to be a due, proper, and valid plea. The judges who heard the case were much annoyed and sorely puzzled by the position into which Bonner, a learned canonist, had thus so adroitly placed Horne. They resolved, therefore, to give no decision whatsoever; for otherwise it must have been clearly and unquestionably against Horne, and in favour of Bonner.

So the proceedings were most irregularly and unjustly stayed and quashed. Bonner was sent back to the unhealthy cells of the Marshalsea. Horne did not venture to tender him the oath again; while the result of this lawsuit sorely vexed and dismayed the new prelates, and annoyed the Queen's Council greatly.

Throughout the whole country the issue of this suit gradually became known, and it was largely discussed. It had effectually served to test the question whether the new bishops and ministers were "true and lawful" or not. The old clergy, who compared the novel form of Ordination with the old, looked upon the new Church officers with both suspicion and aversion, the more vigorous amongst them with contempt. They were unnoticed by the rich and learned,* and despised by the poor and unlettered; so much so indeed that the Supreme Governness had to invoke the aid of Parliament to fill up what was so obviously wanting, and to strengthen that which was so notoriously weak.

* Grindal, when Archbishop of York, writing from Cawood to Cecil, on August 29, 1570, tells him plaintively that he has not been well received; the greater part of the gentlemen of the county being not well affected towards godly religion, and among the common people many superstitious practices remain.—"Domestic State Papers, Elizabeth," vol. lxxiii. p. 390.

An Act of Parliament was therefore passed declaring that the method of making and consecrating the archbishops and bishops of this realm, notwithstanding all objections, was "good, lawful, and perfect." The tedious terminology and numerous redundancies of expression are remarkable; but, inasmuch as, under the circumstances, it was obviously the only method available for settling, once for all, the various disputes* which had arisen on the subject, it is necessary to put a part of it, at all events, on record.

Its preamble asserted that "divers questions by overmuch boldness of speech and talk of the common sort of people, being unlearned, having lately grown," concerning the new kind of Ordinations, whether the same be done according to law or not, "which is much tending to the slander of all the state of the clergy"; therefore, for avoiding such slanderous speech and for enabling Parliament to settle the question, this Act is passed. No reference is made to any rites older than those of King Henry's reign, and whatever has been or is wanting is duly supplied "by the authority of Parliament"—of

* The writers who during Elizabeth's reign dealt with this subject, and who had occasioned such "various disputes," were Harpesfield, Hoskins, Sander, Harding, Stapleton, Allen, Reynolds and others—all of whom, it should be remembered, were English churchmen vigorously resisting the innovators.

course a high authority in things temporal, but nothing more. Parliament, of course, can compass many deeds and effect much, but it is utterly powerless to make either a priest or a bishop, and no Declaration, Resolution, or Statute can render valid and certain any ordination or consecration already invalid or doubtful.

The most important part of the new enactment is now verbally quoted:—

“And further, for the avoiding of all ambiguities and questions, that might be objected against the lawful confirmations, investings, and consecrations of the said archbishops and bishops, Her Highness, in her Letters Patent, under the Great Seal of England, directed to any archbishop, bishop, or others, for confirming, investing, and consecrating of any person elected to the office or dignity of any archbishop or bishop, hath not only used such words and sentences as were accustomed to be used by the said late King Henry, and King Edward, Her Majesty’s father, and brother, in their like Letters Patents, made for such causes, but also hath used, and put in Her Majesty’s said Letters Patents divers other general words and sentences, whereby Her Highness, by her supreme power and authority, hath dispensed with all causes or doubts of any imperfections, or disability, that can or may in anywise be objected against the same, as by Her Majesty’s

said Letters Patents remaining of record more plainly will appear; so that to all those that will well consider of the effect and true intent of the said laws and statutes, and of the supreme and absolute authority of the Queen's Highness, and which she, by Her Majesty's said Letters Patents, hath used, and put in use, in and about the making and consecrating of the said archbishops and bishops, it is, and may be, very evident and apparent that no cause of scruple, ambiguity, or doubt can or may justly be objected against the said elections, confirmations, or consecrations, or any other material thing meet to be used, or had, in or about the same; but that everything requisite and material for that purpose, hath been made and done as precisely, and with as great a care and diligence, or rather more, as ever the like was done before Her Majesty's time, as the records of Her Majesty's said father's and brother's time, and also of her own time, will more plainly testify and declare.

“Wherefore, for the plain declaration of all the premises, and to the intent that the same may the better be known to every of the Queen's Majesty's subjects, whereby such evil speech, as heretofore hath been used against the high state of prelacy, may hereafter cease, be it now declared and enacted, by the authority of this present Parliament, that the said Act and Statute made in

the first year of our said Sovereign Lady, the Queen's Majesty, whereby the said Book of Common Prayer, and the administration of sacraments, with other rites and ceremonies, is authorized and allowed to be used, shall stand and remain good and perfect, to all intents and purposes ; and that such order and form for the consecrating of archbishops and bishops, and for the making of priests, deacons, and ministers, as was set forth in the time of the late King Edward VI., and added to the said Book of Common Prayer, and authorized by Parliament, in the fifth and sixth years of the said late King, shall stand, and be in full force and effect, and shall, from henceforth, be used and observed in all places within this realm, and other the Queen's Majesty's dominions and countries :

“ And that all acts and things heretofore had, made, or done, by any person or persons, in or about any consecrations, confirmation, or investing of any person or persons elected to the office or dignity of any archbishop or bishop within this realm, or within any other the Queen's Majesty's dominions or countries, by virtue of the Queen's Majesty's Letters Patents or commissions, since the beginning of her reign, be, and shall be, by authority of this present Parliament, declared, judged, and deemed, at and from every of the several times of the doing thereof, good and perfect, to all

respects and purposes, any matter or thing that can or may be objected to the contrary thereof, in any wise, notwithstanding :

“ And that all persons that have been, or shall be, made, ordered, or consecrated archbishops, bishops, priests, ministers of God’s Holy Word and Sacraments, or deacons, after the form and order prescribed in the said order and form how archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons, and ministers should be consecrated, made, and ordered, be in very deed, and also by authority hereof declared and enacted to be, and shall be, archbishops, bishops, priests, ministers, and deacons, and rightly made, ordained, and consecrated ; any statute, law, canon, or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Some may say that the deed done, or pretended to be done, by this wordy and unprecedented Act, was in truth a large stretch of the new Supremacy. But surely the same national authority which had created that power, could equally define its limits, supply its existing deficiencies, and furthermore extend its operation.

The Queen herself, however, did not in the least believe—though officially she was bound to do so—in her so-called “Supremacy.” She was not so theoretically uninstructed in the Christian religion, as to conceive for a moment that a woman could either own or exercise such spiritual

power, or that any other warrant for her having assumed such a title as Supreme Governess could be found beyond the bare yet bold decree of the English Parliament. She more than once distinctly admitted as much.* To Lausac, an Envoy from France, sent hither on certain special business, she frankly owned her sure conviction that the Supremacy of the Church of England, and indeed of the whole Family of God, did not belong to her, but to the successor of St. Peter; but she apologetically added that circumstances had created a breach with the Pope, and that the English Parliament and People, having resolved to make a new Church for themselves, she was thus obliged to assume and exercise the office of Supreme Governess of it; in which, for the sake both of convenience and necessity, she was officially compelled to feign her belief.

At the same time that persecution was being carried on against two parties—the anti-innovat-

* This can be seen on record from a perusal of "An Answer to Sir Edward Coke's Reports" (p. 365), the author of which also points out that Lord Montagu and the Earl of Southampton had heard similar expressions of the Queen's mind. So, too, had the Duke of Feria, who, after talking with the Queen on the inherent absurdity of a woman ruling a Church, wrote to his master, King Philip, to inform him that she did not in her innermost heart believe in any such notion, but only took the title and office because Cecil and Bacon had assured her of the urgent necessity of so doing.

ing and the non-conforming—certain foreign princes endeavoured so to influence the Queen that she might be induced to repudiate the wicked and dangerous policy of her advisers—more especially this newly-invented spiritual Supremacy. The Emperor Ferdinand, in a holograph letter, implored Her Majesty not to forsake the religious fellowship of all the Christian princes of Europe, or of a long line of illustrious Catholic ancestors at home; nor to set her own fallible opinion, and that of the “new men of yesterday”—themselves so notoriously unsettled and changeable—in opposition to, and above that of, the Universal Church of Our Redeemer—the Church of fifteen centuries and more. He also entreated her to refrain from imprisoning and persecuting the suffering remnant of true Catholic prelates, whose only fault was that they were loyal and faithful to the almost universal religion of Christendom and its chief Bishop. Moreover, His Majesty suggested that, for those of her subjects whom no fines could make apostates, no bribes serve to pervert, and no persecution alter, some few desecrated and empty churches here and there might be given up for the ancient rites and religion as heretofore.*

* The Queen had already given up the Church of the Austin Friars and the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral to cer-

But these wise and timely proposals fell upon a heart that was being alternately excited by the lusts of the flesh and chilled by the pride of life, and upon a conscience dulled to the voice both of Truth and of Justice. Nothing whatsoever was gained by the Emperor's well-intended and charitable letter. Affairs steadily and surely went from bad to worse.

For practical action the ancient Church-of-England men were at this time led by a very able and remarkable ecclesiastical statesman—a leader of experience, learning, and prudence—who rendered good service to their cause. William Allen, a Lancashire man, educated at Oxford, Fellow of Oriel in due course, and for some years the Principal of St. Mary's Hall in that University, had ever set his face as a rock against the innovators and their innovations. On the death of Queen Mary he had withdrawn to Louvaine, but on his return to England, about this period, became foremost in condemning any participation whatsoever in the mutilated rites or public services of the new religion.* All true Catholics, he asserted,

tain foreign heretics; while the nave of the Abbey of Glastonbury had been actually turned into a workshop for Protestant weavers from Flanders.

* It seems a little doubtful when Dr. Allen was in England. Possibly he may have come over for awhile with Dr. Morton and others to consult the old bishops and the ancient Catholic nobility on his proposition, and soon gone abroad again.

were absolutely bound to abstain from taking any part in the worship set up by Act of Parliament,* and patiently to suffer the consequences of non-compliance. Since the decision at Trent no controversy on the subject could even be entertained. This was Dr. Allen's opinion, stated with lucidity and frankness; and it was largely followed.

When, therefore, this pious and learned churchman (afterwards Cardinal Allen) defended the position of those who sought a remedy for the existing spiritual desolation in England by the establishment of a theological college abroad, he thus beautifully and powerfully wrote, describing the situation exactly:—

“The universal lack, then, of the sovereign sacrifice and sacraments catholicly ministered, without which the soul of man dieth, as the body doth without corporal food; this constraint to the contrary services, whereby men perish everlastingly; this intolerable Oath, repugnant to God, the Church, Her Majesty's honour, and all men's consciences; and the daily dangers, disgraces, vexations, fears, imprisonments, impoverishments, de-

* “In Lancashire,” as Richard Barnes, Bishop of Carlisle, wrote to Cecil, “the people fall from religion, revolt to Popery, and refuse to come to church.”—Carlisle, October 27, 1570, “Domestic State Papers, Elizabeth,” vol. lxxiv. p. 395.

spites, which they must suffer; and the railings and blasphemies against God's sacraments, saints, ministers, and all holies, which they are forced to hear in our country, are the only causes, most dear sirs, or (if we may be so bold, and if Our Lord permit this declaration to come to Her Majesty's reading) Most Gracious Sovereign, why so many of us are departed out of our natural country, and do absent ourselves so long from that place, where we had our being, birth, and bringing-up, through God; and which we desire to serve with all the offices of our life and death, only craving correspondence of the same, as true and natural children of their parents." *

In the year 1569, it seemed to many of those who still remained faithful to the Old Religion, that, as a consequence of the action of the Fathers of Trent, they were being verily driven to desperation by the cruel severity of the penal enactments; by the gross persecution which, over and above the law, was notoriously connived at and tolerated; and by their own utter inability, as mere isolated units, to defend themselves, to stem the tide of social ruin, or to oppose the policy of those who were in authority. Amongst the new

* "Apologie and True Declaration of the Institution of the English Colleges," &c., pp. 12, 13.

ministers controversy and squabbles appeared interminable.* The old clergy had either been silenced, or compelled to adopt the new religion, its regulations and worship. Numbers of the most learned who had refused to do so—dignitaries of the highest rank—had been deprived, imprisoned, or sent abroad. Many more, the very flower of the learned clergy, had become voluntary exiles. Protests and expostulations to the harsh makers of cruel laws were useless. These had been made in abundance, in various forms and shapes, by various persons; but, as already pointed out, were made in vain. For nobody heeded them. Obedience to the new laws was carefully exacted from all. The dictates of conscience, like the Ancient Faith and rites, were laughed to scorn. Men who clung to the old Religion were harassed to death by persecution, fines, and imprisonment. The many sores in the body politic were deliberately and carefully kept

* "Our people (the innovators and so-called 'Reformers') are carried away with every wind of doctrine. If you know what their belief is to-day, you cannot tell what it will be to-morrow. Is there one article of religion in which these communities, which are at war with the Pope, agree together? If you run over all the articles, from the first to the last, you will not find one which is not held by some of them to be an article of faith, and rejected by others as an impiety."—"Letter of Dudith to Capitonius," amongst the "Epistola Bezae."

open. Rich and poor, ignorant and learned, alike suffered. So deep was the feeling of irritation in the Northern Counties, that under the guidance of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, the people eventually rose as one man to throw off the unbearable burdens by which they were thus oppressed. Her Majesty, it was maintained, was surrounded "by divers new set-upp nobles, who not only go about to overthrow and put downe the ancient nobilitie of the realme, but also have misused the Quene's Majestie's own personne,* and also have by the space of twelve years nowe past sett upp and mayntained a new-found religion and heresie contrarie to God's Word." † In Yorkshire, Durham, and Northumberland, there had long been a stir amongst all classes. Dr. Nicholas Morton, sometime a Prebendary of York, who had gone to Rome for counsel and advice, came back again with the rank and office of Apostolical Penitentiary; in order to bestow afresh upon those ancient clergy who so deliberately rejected the innovations, those special faculties required, and that needful jurisdiction

* This was evidently a direct allusion to Robert Dudley, who elsewhere was characterized, with regard to his relations with the Queen, in terms which cannot be decently quoted.

† Author's Excerpts and MSS.

desired, which so many believed to have lapsed altogether. He was a near relation of the old Yorkshire families of Markenfeld and Norton, owned considerable influence, and had long done his best to band together the leading representatives of the ancient nobility in resisting the innovators. He received sympathy and support from the families of Dacres, Ratcliffe, Swinbourne, and Tempest—names to be had in renown. During the summer and autumn he visited these and other families at their pleasant homes, where his welcome was hearty and sincere; and pointed out plainly the only practical remedy for discord and disunion. His words were acceptable. But, when he treated of passive obedience, his advice was not taken by all. Some were for action rather than words. Words and expostulations were useless. Strength must now be met by strength: the Brute Force of unbelief and revolution by the chivalry of Faith and Self-sacrifice.

As Sir Ralph Sadler was careful to inform the Court, there were not at that time “in all this country ten gentlemen that do favor and allow of Her Majesty’s proceedings in the cause of religion.” * When forced by fine and confiscation to attend the now dreary services and dreadful

* Sir Ralph Sadler’s “State Papers,” vol. ii. p. 55.

sermons of the new Calvinistic religionists—in which damnation was sternly dealt out to all doubters of their own and their partizans' election—and this entirely against their consciences, they were only the more exasperated by such enforced attendance, and made the more discontented. On this point sentiment, both amongst rich and poor, was almost unanimous. The Countess of Westmoreland, and several members of the Markenfeld and Norton* families were for open and active resistance. Some asserted that Dr. Allen favoured this policy. In the middle of November, therefore, the banners of another Pilgrimage of Grace were unfurled, and many prayers went up to Heaven for success and victory.

At Durham, which was immediately occupied by the armed retainers of the two earls, High Mass was once more celebrated in the cathedral, in the presence of several thousand earnest and excited worshippers. Whittingham, the pseudo-dean,† who had never received any ordination whatsoever by a bishop, and therefore was a mere layman, with a great show of practical wisdom,

* See pedigree of "Norton, *alias* Conyers," pp. 244, &c., of "The Visitation of Yorkshire," edited by Joseph Foster. London: 1875.

† William Whittingham, a layman, installed October 8th, 1563, died 10th June 1579.

took himself out of harm's way with more than convenient speed. In the cathedral the "tressells of bordes" for the Lord's Supper were ignominiously kicked out of the choir, and broken into splinters; the English Bible and the Zwinglian service-books were enthusiastically torn into fragments. Nobody desired that the Word of God should be doctored by mis-translations, omissions, and false human glosses. A portable altar was set up at the east end of the deep choir, flanked by velvet hangings; and a processional crucifix with taper-bearers on either side was uplifted once again at the head of the procession in that sacred sanctuary. The old vestments were brought out from the sacristy; the wax tapers were once more lit; a chalice and ciborium of precious metal, with a York Missal, were sought out anew and used; while the voices of those who sang the *Gloria in excelsis*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, and *Benedictus* of the Sacred Mass—an united crowd, which filled the Norman nave from northern side to southern, and from the sanctuary steps to the western Galilee—rose grandly like the sound of many waters.

From Durham the "Pilgrims of Grace" marched southwards, in strict order and with some confidence, issuing appeals to the afflicted populace westward and eastward to rise in defence of the Religion of their forefathers. The watch-

words, "God, Our Lady, and the Catholic Faith," were passed from lip to lip, and from village to village. Bells from the church-towers welcomed the Pilgrims with merry peals. The old clergy came out of their retreats and seclusion to offer a silent prayer for success, or to bestow a coveted blessing, as the army with banners passed along the northern lanes. The innovators, on the other hand, cowardly and terrified, offered no resistance. Some few stared with astonishment, but did nothing more. At Darlington and Staindrop the Mass was restored amidst the acclamations and thanksgiving of thousands. People, congratulating each other, flocked in from the villages around to worship and rejoice. The Banner of Our Divine Redeemer, representing His Blessed Passion and Sacred Wounds, was borne by an old esquire, Richard Norton, whose Christian character and high social position had, for many years, secured the respect and affection of the populace. At Richmond and at Ripon the Pilgrims were also welcomed and strengthened, and there likewise the old rites were restored: so that the Court, on learning from Sir Ralph Sadler of what was taking place, became thoroughly alarmed; while the Supreme Governness, after her impressive but unhallowed custom, swore like an excited fishwife.

But the royal plans in opposition to this move-

ment had been well made. The Earl of Warwick was steadily advancing northwards with twelve thousand soldiers. Lord Hunsdon, likewise, was on the march. Troops under the command of the Earl of Sussex, who had made York his headquarters, soon afterwards came up to and faced the Pilgrims. Spies and agents had already misrepresented the advance of many other forces of the Crown; so that the insurgents, losing heart, and being divided in counsels, ill-fed and dispirited, at length dispersed and fled. The Earl of Westmoreland succeeded in making his escape to Flanders; but the Earl of Northumberland, crossing the Scottish Border, was soon confined as a prisoner by the Regent Murray in Lochleven Castle. Many of the northern gentry also escaped to Scotland, and obtained protection from the heads of the southern clans.

At home the work of vengeance, which more than rivalled the cruelties of William the Conqueror, began with no delay.

Martial law was everywhere proclaimed. Of the nobility and gentlefolk there were no less than fifty-seven promptly attainted of treason. The legal machinery speedily did its work. Their confiscated lands, goods, and chattels, served both to pay the expenses of the royal troops and to reward those who had condescended to do the Queen's dreadful work at the

same time. No less than three hundred villages were at once wasted with fire and sword. People who had heard Mass, as well as priests who had said Mass, were specially singled out for severity. Anyone who confessed to have carried a cross, worn a surplice, or borne a banner, stood self-convicted of treason; and was decreed to be "strung up" without mercy or delay. An old widow-woman named Alice Wilkinson, who had been seen to use her beads and pray for Esquire Norton and the Pilgrims, found her cottage in flames over her head, and herself homeless and penniless, as a fitting punishment. Most persons will think this too severe. Homesteads and farm produce, however, in general, were ruthlessly burnt, and cottages destroyed; while in every town and village the gibbets were hung with the carcasses of those who had been killed. Many were turned out to die in the cold of a severe winter. Sir William Cecil had personally given strict orders that the chief inhabitants of each township should be at once summoned before the soldiery, and compelled by imprisonment or starvation—if need be "by lack of food" was his exact phrase—to disclose the names of those of their neighbours who had joined in the rebellion. Sussex, naturally harsh, appears, in doing this, to have shown no mercy whatsoever. Three hundred people, in the County Palatine of Dur-

ham, at once suffered death ; but, in writing to Cecil, on the 28th of December, the Earl of Sussex informs him that the number of those hung was at present uncertain, but “ I guess,” he continues, “ that it will not be under six or seven hundred at the least that shall be executed of the common sort, besides the prisoners taken in the field,” who appear to have been at once cruelly butchered in cold blood. Subsequent to this, Lord Sussex, using again a favourite and expressive Elizabethan phrase, ordered eighty to be “strung up” without benefit of clergy,—that is unconfessed, unabsolved, and uncommunicated,—at Durham, forty-one at Darlington, twenty at Barnard Castle, and no less than one hundred and seventy-two in the other towns and villages of that county. To all, religious consolations were peremptorily refused. The poor creatures were forced to die without either prayers, houselling, or unction. Numbers more were imprisoned, half-starved, tortured in various modes, beaten, hung up by the wrists to a beam, and otherwise grossly maltreated ; but several of those who survived were subsequently pardoned, on the sole and express condition that they took the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy. Those who declined to allow that the Queen was Supreme Governess of the Church were compelled to linger on for years, and finally to rot and die in prison.

During the perpetration of these Nero-like atrocities, it appears that even the stern Lord Sussex was not sufficiently prompt in his harshness, nor savage in his cruelty, to satisfy the requirements of his most religious and gracious Queen. What he had done was good and politic as far as it went, she intimated; but Her Sacred Majesty was evidently anxious to hear of the perpetration of yet further and greater severities.* "The Queen's Majesty," as he informed his lieutenants, "doth much marvel that the executions are not yet ended, and she disburdened of the charges which are considered for that respect; wherefore I pray you heartily to use expedition [in torturing, starving, and hanging] for I fear this lingering will breed displeasure to us both."†

The stern calamities which befel the old nobility of the north and their faithful retainers, on this

* See "Memorials of the Northern Rebellion," by Sir Cuthbert Sharp, from which interesting and valuable compilation the main facts of the text have been thankfully taken.

† Later on, it appears that even Lord Sussex was thoroughly weary of his bloody work and brutal butcheries; for he wrote complainingly to Cecil: "I was first a lieutenant; I was after little better than a marshal; I had then nothing left to me but hanging matters." For further evidence regarding the putting down of this rebellion, the original letters of Sir George Bowes, quoted by Sir Cuthbert Sharp, furnish most reliable but melancholy information.

and on other occasions, are not forgotten even at the present day. Their chivalric deeds of unselfish daring, having inspired some of the most musical ballad-writers of former days, when they penned their touching songs; noble aspirations and lofty thoughts being thus scattered like good seed, which bore good fruit for many an after generation. Through times of moral darkness and heresy, in the esquire's hall, and round the cottage hearth, of the northern counties,—the land of the Percies, the Nortons, and the Nevilles, —touching records of faithfulness to conscience, fidelity to God, and of noble self-sacrifice, were, with tearful eye and faltering voice, told to those who came after,—by which for generations many a sanctified heart was silently edified, and many a strong arm nerved for the doing of good and great deeds.

Early in the spring of the year 1570, the saintly and self-denying* Pontiff, Pope Pius V., at last

* "Pius V.," wrote Lord Macaulay, "under his gorgeous vestments, wore day and night the hair-shirt of a simple friar; walked barefoot in the streets at the head of processions; found, in the midst of his most pressing avocations, time for private prayer; often regretted that the public duties of his station were unfavourable to growth in holiness; and edified his flock by innumerable instances of humility, charity, and forgiveness of injuries; while at the same time he upheld the Authority of his See with all the stubbornness and vehemence of Hildebrand."—Essays, Ranke's "History of the Popes," *in loco*.

issued his solemn Bull of Excommunication against Queen Elizabeth. Some assert that the absence of any authority from Rome to defend their righteous cause by force of arms, had powerfully influenced several of the old nobility in their action with reference to the recent Pilgrimage of Grace; and induced them to desist altogether from active co-operation with those who, as a last resort, had been driven to take up arms in defence of God, the Church, and their country. Henceforth such a doubt could not exist. The terms of the Bull are luminous, concise, and full of vigour. Warnings from one who certainly had the right to make them, the Chief Bishop of Christendom, had remained unnoticed; friendly expostulations were wholly unheeded; his patience had been taken undue advantage of; it was now the obvious duty of the Father of the Faithful to act. Of the World's Redeemer and King it had been foretold by David, long previously to the Incarnation—"He shall call Me, Thou art My Father, My God and My strong salvation: and I will make Him My First-born, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for Him for evermore; and My covenant shall stand fast with Him. . . . But if His children forsake My law, and walk not in My judgment; if they break My statutes and keep not My commandments, I will visit their offences with the rod and

their sin with scourges.”* The divine and eternal Kingdom, thus prophesied of, then existed. Christ ruled everywhere by delegation. Parish priest, bishop, metropolitan, archbishop, and patriarch, each and all, in due order and subordination, and with their legitimate authority acknowledged, in their degree represented our ascended Lord. But the Bishop of the See of St. Peter represented Him in one eminent and special manner, claiming jurisdiction over the whole Family of God. Most confused and inexact notions exist regarding this jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff. All that was claimed for him was an acknowledgment that, as Chief Bishop of Christendom, he had everywhere authority to reform and redress heresies, errors, and abuses within the Church, which was not confined to any place or nation, but was Catholic or Universal. Furthermore, so as to avoid discord and disputes, and to preserve the visible and actual unity of the Episcopate, it belonged to the Holy Father to confirm the election of bishops and to approve of and sanction their institution. He also claimed to grant to the clergy licenses of non-residence, and permission to hold more than one benefice with cure of souls, as also to dispense by act and

* Psalm xcix. 27-32.

deed with the canonical impediments to matrimony; and finally he received appeals from the highest spiritual courts throughout the whole Christian World. In England the lawful successor of him who had sent St. Austin to Kent, and by whose authority he had placed his chair as archbishop at Canterbury, by whose own graces and miracles the beautiful Tree of the Church had taken root downward and borne fruit upward,—now so weightily spoke, not with the stuttering accents of usurping and pitiful heretics, but with the due and delegated authority of the First-born of the Most Highest. Here follows an English version of this important Latin Bull:—

“Sentence declaratory of Our Sovereign Lord, the Pope Pius V., against Elizabeth, pretended Queen of England, and the heretics who abet her, whereby all subjects are declared released from the Oath of Allegiance, and every other bond, and those who hereafter shall obey her, are bound by the bond of Anathema.

“Pius, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, in memorial of the matter.

“The sovereign jurisdiction of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church (outside of which there is no salvation), has been given by Him, unto Whom all power in heaven and on earth is given, the King Who reigns on high, to but one person on the face of the earth, even to Peter,

Prince of the Apostles, and to the successor of Peter, the Bishop of Rome. Him He has set up over all nations, and over all kingdoms, to root up and destroy, to waste and to scatter, to plant and to build; to the end that he may maintain in the Unity of the spirit the faithful people bound together by the bond of charity, and present them unto Him their Saviour perfect and without loss.

“In the discharge of this duty, We, whom God of His goodness has called to the Government of His Church, shrink from no labour, striving with all Our might to preserve in their integrity that very Unity and the Catholic Religion which are now assailed by so many storms, by His permission from Whom they come, for Our correction, and for the trial of the faith of His children. But the wicked are so many, and are growing so strong, that there is no part of the world which they have not attempted to corrupt by their evil doctrines; among others labouring for this end is the servant of iniquity Elizabeth, the pretended Queen of England, with whom, as in a safe refuge, the worst of these men have found a secure retreat.

“This woman having taken possession of the kingdom, unnaturally claims for herself the place, the great authority and jurisdiction of the sovereign head of the Church throughout all England, and has involved in miserable ruin that kingdom

so lately recovered to the Catholic faith and piety.

“She has forbidden by the strong hand of power the observance of the True Religion, overturned by the apostate Henry VIII., and by the help of the Holy See restored by Mary, the lawful queen, of illustrious memory. She has followed after and accepted the errors of heretics. She has driven the English nobles out of the Royal Council, and filled their places with obscure heretics. She has been the ruin of those who profess the Catholic Faith, and has brought back again the wicked preachers and ministers of impieties. She has done away with the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Divine Office, fasting, the distinction of meats, celibacy, and the Catholic rites. She has ordered the use of books, containing manifest heresy, throughout the realm, and the observance by her subjects of impious mysteries and ordinances, according to the rule of Calvin, accepted and practised by herself.

“She has dared to take away their churches and benefices from the bishops, the parish priests, and other Catholic ecclesiastics, and has given them with other ecclesiastical goods to heretics. She has made herself a judge in ecclesiastical causes. She has forbidden the prelates, clergy, and people to acknowledge the Church of Rome, or to obey its mandates and the Catholic consti-

tutions. She has compelled many to take an oath to observe her wicked laws, to renounce the authority of the Roman Pontiff, to refuse to obey him, and to accept her as the sole ruler in temporal and spiritual matters. She has decreed pains and penalties against those who do not submit to her, and has inflicted them upon those who continue in the unity of the faith and obedience.

“ She has thrown Catholic prelates and parish priests into prison, where many, worn out by sorrows and their protracted sufferings, have ended their days in misery.

“ All this being notorious and known unto all nations, and so confirmed by very many grave witnesses, as to leave no room for palliation, defence, or concealment, sin being added to sin, and iniquity to iniquity, the persecution of the faithful, and the ruin of religion daily growing more and more at the suggestion and under the direction of Elizabeth aforesaid, whose will is so obstinate and whose heart is so hardened that she has set at nought not only the charitable prayers and counsels of Catholic princes entreating her to return to a better mind and be converted, but also Our own, by her refusal to allow the Nuncios of the Holy See to enter the realm. We, having recourse, by necessity compelled, to the weapons of justice, are unable to control Our grief that We

must proceed against one whose predecessors have rendered signal services to Christendom.

“Relying, then, on His authority Who has placed Us on this sovereign throne of justice, though unequal to the bearing of so great a burden, We declare, in the fulness of the Apostolic power, the aforesaid Elizabeth a heretic, and an encourager of heretics, together with those who abet her, under the sentence of excommunication, cut off from the unity of the Body of Christ.

“Moreover, We declare that she has forfeited her pretended title to the aforesaid kingdom, to all and every right, dignity, and privilege; We also declare that the nobles, the subjects, and the people of the kingdom aforesaid, who have taken any oath to her, are for ever released from that oath, and from every obligation of allegiance, fealty, and obedience, as We now by these Letters release them, and deprive the said Elizabeth of her pretended right to the throne, and every other right whatsoever aforesaid: We command all and singular the nobles, the people subject to her, and others aforesaid, never to venture to obey her monitions, mandates, and laws.

“If any shall contravene this Our decree, We bind them with the same bond of anathema.

“Seeing that it would be a work of too much difficulty to send these Letters to every place where it is necessary to send them, Our will is that a

copy thereof by a public notary, sealed with the seal of an ecclesiastical prelate, or with the seal of his court, shall have the same force in courts of law and everywhere throughout the world that these Letters themselves have if they be produced and shown.

“ Given at St. Peter’s, in Rome, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord One thousand five hundred and sixty-nine, on the fifth of the calends of March,* in the fifth year of Our Pontificate.

“ CÆ. GLORIERIUS.

“ H. CUMYN.”

What resulted from this Bull will be apparent from the events of later years—to be recorded and commented upon in due course.

In the spring of the year 1571, there was a severe, sharp, and carefully-organized raid upon the beggars. In the north the distress, of course, was most severe. Hundreds in the past winter had died of starvation. Poverty, even then, as may be noted, was a sin for which, by order of the autocratic authorities, there was to be no absolution and no forgiveness. Charity was dead.

* February 27, 1570, according to the present computation. Anciently the year began on the 25th of March.

Selfishness reigned.* The poor and miserable were hateful to look upon and expensive to feed. The old were far too long-lived. Somehow or another they must be put out of the way or confined to their miserable habitations. When the Queen took her journeys through the country, therefore, the lean, the famished, the wolf-like and the repulsive-looking, were now, by special Privy Council order, to be carefully kept out of her royal sight; for she disliked their aspect and dreaded their cries of hunger. Thirty years ago and more, the monasteries had all been destroyed, and with them had been lost any adequate realization of the duty of practising the corporal

* As Bishop Sandys himself wrote:—"But we are fallen into these evil times, wherein iniquity aboundeth, and charity waxeth cold. Hearty love is turned into hearty hatred: our hands are bloody, and our hearts malicious. He liveth not that loveth his neighbour as himself. If we did love our neighbours as ourselves, we would not oppress them with extortion and usury: we would not undermine them, and wring them in bargaining: we would not so proudly contemn them, so spitefully envy them, so impudently slander them, or so greedily practise for their infamy and discredit: we would not speak them fair, and mind them evil; fawn on them, and betray them; seek our credit by their reproach, our gain by their loss: when we see their necessities, we would relieve and succour them, bind up their wounds with the good Samaritan, and charitably provide for them."—"Sandys' Works," pp. 206, 207, Parker Society. London: 1842.

works of mercy; for good deeds were regarded by the new Gospellers as "filthy rags." Most of the older monks and friars had found their only rest in death. But of the younger who had been professed, some still lived; a few had passively accepted the new state of affairs; while many of the lay-brothers had no doubt become mendicants—reasonably dissatisfied with having lost their only homes, and having no apparent chance of obtaining work in the present, and less hope of being able to keep body and soul together in the future.

These and such as these, their name was "Legion," seemed to fill the land—for field after field remained untilled; acre after acre now lay fallow—they infested the towns and villages, the wild bye-ways and out-of-the-way hamlets, asking alms of esquire and yeoman, hind and peasant, at the portal of the hall and at the thatched porch of the cottage; living often during autumn on wild fruit, uncooked roots, and during winter upon the barley-bread of alms. In the frost and cold they frequently herded with the cattle at night, or in summer went to rest under hedges and trees. With no apparent means of subsistence, and always practically witnessing against the success of the New Religion,—for they constantly deplored the destruction of the religious houses,—and often, when lingering near village cross or

wayside hostel, in language frequently bold and sometimes possibly seditious, they forcibly contrasted the Past with the Present, to the grave disparagement of the latter, and to the annoyance of the powers that were.

Such dangerous wanderers, therefore, as the Privy Council determined,* must now be everywhere persecuted; hunted from pillar to post; examined by justices of the peace to find out if they used the rosary or sympathized with the Old Religion; flogged on their naked backs, without regard either to age or sex, for being poor and having no

* It was required by the Privy Council that "certificates of all the vagabonds, rogues, and mighty valiant beggars, men and women," who had been "examined, whipped, stocked, and punished according to law," should be duly made out and sent up.—"Domestic State Papers, Elizabeth," vol. lxxx., August 20, 1571. In Gloucestershire, William Wynter, justice of the peace, and others, have made search for vagabonds, but have found none but such poor beggarly persons as are not thought fit to trouble their lordships with.—August 27, 1571. At Aylesford, on August 28, the justices of Kent apprehended "thirteen men and women, stout and valiant vagabonds, all of whom have been stocked and whipped severely."—Vol. lxxx. At Thame, in Oxfordshire, some "proper stoute abbey-men" were convicted and punished as vagabonds. Of these it is stated that on September 8th, 1571, "they took their stocking and whipping verie ill. So they were sore bloodied, and one thereafter died, no long while thereupon."—Author's MSS., from Churchwardens' and Parish Accounts of Thame.

home ; put into the stocks on a starvation allowance for several days ; whipped afresh when they were taken out, until the purple wale-marks on their shoulders became bloody wounds, from which the gore trickled downwards to the earth ; while sometimes the poor creatures, being so weak with want of food, and feeble and shrunken because of their poverty, suddenly sunk senseless towards the ground, straining the cords round their wrists, and so were literally flogged to death.

It was an awful sight and a horrible ; worthy of the reign of a woman falsely called “ glorious ” and “ good,”—a sight to have made angels weep and Englishmen shudder and sicken ; and a national sin well meriting all the various and heavy punishments which one after another descended sixty years afterwards upon our distracted nation, during those fearful twenty winters and more of the miseries of the Great Rebellion and the dire slaughter of the Civil War.

CHAPTER IV.

THE two events recently recorded, viz. the formal condemnation of the Queen by Pope Pius V., and the strong determination to persecute even unto death, and so extirpate, those of the English poor who still adhered to the Old Religion, by taking care that all obstinate persons of that class could be summarily and easily dealt with and disposed of by the new laws, effectively cleared the way for the Queen's advisers, and enabled them to act with still greater decision than they had hitherto shown. The recent enactment against beggars would enable the authorities to worry, starve, brand with a hot iron, flog and put in the stocks and pillory, any persons of the lower or migratory class supposed to be dangerous. The possession of a string of prayer-beads, a crucifix, an *Agnus Dei*, or any foreign book of devo-

tions, served to secure for the poverty-stricken possessor of it, the title of "Italianate atheist."* A poor, friendless man who was found saying his prayers on a rosary, at the steps of a wayside cross, was held to be a certain ally of the Pope and a possible assassin of the Queen. As regards the Bull of Pius V., Cecil and Walsingham could never henceforth mistake the attitude of the Primate of Christendom. Exercising his acknowledged powers, he had at length drawn the spiritual sword from its scabbard—as all the European nations then saw, and had spoken out in a cause in which, as the Father of the Faithful, he believed himself to have both an official and personal interest. His Holiness had not acted in haste, nor without a perfect knowledge of the degraded state of England, nor without exact information of what the new prelates preached and taught; † nor without constant

* "The number of obdurate Papists and Italianate atheists is great at this time, both desperate, and grown, as it evidently appeareth, to the nature of assassins."—Grindal to Lord Treasurer Burghley, 29th January 1572, "Grindal's Remains," p. 333, Parker Society's Works.

† Sandys had written thus:—"Our Gracious Governor (*i.e.* Elizabeth) . . . hath caused all rubbish and whatsoever was hurtful to be removed; the den of thieves to be dispersed; buyers and sellers of Popish trash, monks, friars, massmongers, with like miscreants, to be hurled and whipped out, the stumbling-stones of superstition, the baggage of

consultation with those exiles for their faith at Rome,* who knew the exact situation accurately, and were able to afford him the most complete information as to what was needed. Queen Elizabeth's bishops were obviously and notoriously of a new and unprecedented kind and make.† Her

man's traditions, with all monuments of idolatry, vanity, and Popery, to be cast out of the House of God and vineyard of the Lord."—"Sandys' Works," p. 59, Parker Society. London: 1842.

"The Popish Church hath neither the true foundation, nor yet the right marks of the Church of God; her foundation is man; her 'marks' are blasphemy, idolatry, superstition. Christ is 'the Head of His Body the Church'; this Head cannot err. The head of the Church anti-Christian is the Pope, that man of sin, a liar; yea, a very father of lies."—*Ibid.* p. 67.

* These were Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph; Glennock, Bishop-elect of Bangor; Nicholas Morton, Prebendary of York; Henshaw, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford; Daniel, Dean of Hereford; Bromborough, Hall, and Kirton, Doctors of Divinity, and some other priests of experience and good reputation.

† "The position of bishops in the Church of England has been from the first anomalous. The Episcopate was violently separated from the Papacy, to which it would have preferred to remain attached, and, to secure its obedience, it was made dependent on the Crown. The method of episcopal appointments, instituted by Henry VIII. as a temporary expedient, and abolished under Edward as an unreality, was re-established by Elizabeth, not certainly because she believed that the invocation of the Holy Ghost was required for the completeness of an election which her own choice had already determined, not because the bishops obtained any gifts or grace in their consecration which she herself respected, but because the shadowy form of an election, with a religious ceremony following it, gave them the semblance of spiritual

“ministers,” whatever they were, were certainly not of the same order as the parish clergy of old. The “ancient priests” altogether repudiated the new; while the new in turn caricatured and condemned the old as worshippers of the Blessed Sacrament, which they so profanely termed “Jack-in-the-Box,” and of idols. A strong measure would evidently not have been adopted, if one less vigorous and decisive would have been likely to have wrought a cure.

It was not, however, the Queen’s dealings with her own religious subjects alone which brought about the Holy Father’s action. At the instigation of her ministers she had again and again proclaimed herself the determined opponent everywhere of the cause of Catholic Christianity abroad. Secretly yet efficiently, by the aid of spies, secret agents, and bribes, she had co-operated with the

independence, the semblance without the substance, which qualified them to be the instruments of the system which she desired to enforce. They were tempted to presume on their phantom dignity, till the sword of a second Cromwell taught them the true value of their apostolic descent; and we have a right to regret that the original theory of Cranmer was departed from—that being officers of the Crown, as much appointed by the Sovereign as the Lord Chancellor, the bishops should not have worn openly their real character and received their appointments immediately by letters patent without further ceremony.”—Froude’s “History of England,” vol. vi. pp. 552, 553. London: 1870.

fanatical rebels of several neighbouring states in opposing their sovereigns; and this not unfrequently when she herself professed to be at peace with the latter, and actually had accredited ministers at their respective courts. Her treatment of Mary, Queen of Scots, likewise, was marked by gross injustice, and by indecency without a parallel. This treatment ensued because of Queen Mary's religion: for she was the last hope of those who looked for another restoration of the Ancient Faith. The persecution which she endured,—and which, as will be seen, terminated in her murder,—she endured because she was true to that Faith, from which in no single *iota* did she intentionally swerve.

Here, therefore, it will be convenient to set forth with certain detail and at some considerable length, in a record ranging over several years, the true state of ecclesiastical affairs, both as concerns the kingdom in general and certain parts of it in particular. A private letter, an official document, a public trial, or a personal squabble between officials, may often comprise much of interest and point, as will be shown. The changes which had now taken place had been brought about, not by unauthorized private individuals acting on their own responsibility, but by exalted officials, the archbishops and chief bishops of the National Church, who had been clothed with all

such temporal authority as Parliament could authorize the Queen to bestow upon them; and who had indeed worked with a will and system both in the overthrow of the Old, and the consolidation of the New Religion. Some readers, in that which follows, may think that out-of-the-way and valueless details of information have been gathered together without object; but surely any record of facts which serves to bring out points of historical interest may well be rescued from oblivion and be made to serve its purpose.

Throughout the whole of the Queen's reign, there had been constant complaints from all quarters of the difficulty in getting the existing cures served by persons who could read sufficiently well to recite the Morning and Evening Prayers. Early in Parker's episcopate, in addition to the "readers" everywhere set apart, he had ordained more than a hundred and twenty "ministers" in one week; and many of these were reported to have been schoolmasters, "scribes," "most ignorant persons," * tradesmen

* "What must we say, when most of them are Popish priests, consecrated to perform Mass, and *the far greater part of the remainder are most ignorant persons, appointed at the will of the people, not to the ministry of the Word?*"—George Withers to the Elector Palatine, Letter lxii, "Zurich Letters," 2nd Series, Parker Society. Parker's admissions may be thus read in his own words: "Whereas, occasioned by the

who had failed to get their living, and even husbandmen. When these persons, in their ordinary secular habits,* appeared in the pulpits, they made such a deplorable exhibition of their fanaticism and ignorance, that the congregation was sometimes moved to laughter and ribaldry, the new service was brought into contempt, and the people declined to go to church at all. This kind of irreverent exhibition became so common at one

great want of ministers, we and you, brother, for tolerable supply thereof, have heretofore admitted into the ministry sundry artificers and others not traded and brought up in learning, and as it happened in a multitude some that were of base occupation; forasmuch as now by experience it is seen that such manner of men, partly by reason of their previous profane acts, partly by their light behaviour otherwise and trade of life, are very offensive unto the people, yea, and to the wise of the realm [*i.e.* to Bacon and Cecil], are thought to do great deal more hurt than good, the Gospel there sustaining slander; these shall be to desire and require you hereafter to be very circumspect in admitting any to the ministry, and only to allow such as having good testimony of their honest conversation, have been traded and exercised in learning, or at the least have spent their time with teaching of children, excluding all others which have been brought up and sustained themselves either by occupation or other kinds of life alienated from learning.”—“Archbishop Matthew Parker’s Correspondence,” vol. i. p. 121.

* So averse was Dr. Turner, holding the important position of Dean of Wells, to sacerdotal habits, that acting in his official capacity in 1565 he caused a common adulterer to do public penance in a priest’s square cap.—See Dr. W. Turner to H. Bullinger, Letter li., July 23rd, 1566, “Zurich Letters,” 2nd Series, Parker Society.

period, that disputes and brawls constantly occurred, even at the font and Communion board. The consequence was that fresh legislation took place, by which all criticism of these distressing ministers during divine service was forbidden under pains and penalties,* though the practice was not by any means stopped. It has been calculated that out of the nine thousand benefices, including chapelries attached to mother churches, which about the year 1570 required pastors, at least half were unoccupied and unserved during the greater part of this Queen's reign. The work of destruction had not been so difficult as was anticipated: the work of reparation and restoration would possibly remain uncommenced, most certainly uncrowned, for generations.

In some cases the lay-leaders and allies of the innovators, needy gentlefolks, succeeded in getting themselves appointed to vacant cures, more especially to those impoverished. Benefices which had thus remained unfilled for several years, (they were numerous,) were often granted to the new

* One of the bishops thus inquired:—"Whether there be any that hath unreverently abused or given any evill and unseemly terms of any minister of God's Word and Sacraments . . . either in the time of his celebration of Divine Service, or Sermon, or in the time of the administration of the sacraments in the Church?"—Visitation Articles of Thornborough, Bishop of Bristol, 1603.

nobles, to knights,* and to Protestant yeomen who asked for them. Sometimes one person would secure as many as four or five cures within a given radius. He thus became the "farmer" of the various benefices, and was known as such; and then proceeded to seek out some "abbey-man," "old schoolmaster," or "cunning scribe and reader," who would be prepared to minister alternately at the various churches for some pitiable and paltry pittance. Many of these were unordained.† By increasing the rents of the church

* In Edward VI.'s reign William Cecil, a layman (eventually Lord Burghley), had been made Rector of Wimbledon, and occupied the Rectory-House. At the same period the Princess Elizabeth secured, through Cecil himself, the parsonage of Harptree in Somersetshire for "Master John Kenyon," who had been yeoman of her robes—of course only a layman. He was, however, duly instituted, and then hired a "reader" to supply his place and do the work while he received the revenues. Examples of this kind of jobbery are constantly met with in the official correspondence of the Reformation-bishops.

† Of a certain Lowth, a minister of Carlisle side, Grindal, after some inquiry as to the fact, wrote to Parker, on the 4th March 1575, "I think it will fall forth that *he was never ordered priest or minister; and yet hath he these fifteen or sixteen years exercised that function.*"—"Grindal's Remains," p. 353, Parker Society. Eleven years afterwards Bishop Aylmer, in the diocese of London, officially inquired "whether any ministers appointed *without orders taken of the Bishops* do baptize, minister the Communion, or deal in any function ecclesiastical?"—Aylmer's "Articles of Enquiry," 1586. In the Queen's letter to the bishops, for suppressing "prophesyings," she asserts that "in sundry parts of Our realm

lands; by inducing the reader to curtail the appointed services, and so get through four or five in one day; by private arrangements with the diocesan officials who winked at such proceedings (if paid to close their eyes or purposely look in another direction); these "benefice-farmers" were thus enabled to squeeze a little more out of the impoverished cures. Giving as little as they could and getting as much, the last thought that ever entered the heads of such reforming-gentry was any consideration for the neglected population. "Greed of gain," as Archbishop Parker admitted and deplored, "be, together with self-seeking, eating up of all charity to God and one's neighbour."

The Archbishop's opinions concerning ordination, its true nature, importance, and value, may not inaccurately be gathered, though but indirectly, from a very important letter written to

there are no small number of persons presuming to be teachers and preachers of the Church (*though neither lawfully thereunto called, nor yet fit for the same*).—Cotton MS., British Museum; Cleopatra, F. 2, folio 287. January 4th, 1572: William Bele, M.A., was presented to the Prebend of Scalford, *alias* Scarford, at the Queen's presentation by lapse; because one Alwood, the pretended Canon and Prebendary, was *merè laicus*, as it is set down in the Register."—Strype's "Annals," vol. ii., Part I., p. 277. Oxford: 1824.

him by Jewell,* Bishop of Salisbury, dated April 26th, 1568, as follows :—

“Whereas I wrote of late unto Your Grace touching the bearer M. Lancaster, now elect of Armagh,† that it might please Your Grace to stay him from further ordering of ministers, it may now like the same to understand that I have sithence communed with the same M. Lancaster concerning the same, and find by his own confession that he hath already ordered divers (although not so many as it was reported) : Howbeit among the same he hath admitted and ordered one whom by the space of these eight years I, for many good and just causes me moving, evermore have refused. Your Grace may further advertize him hereof, as unto your wisdom shall seem good ; certainly in such cases his discretion is very small.”

Now when the date of this letter is carefully noted, it is found that Lancaster was not consecrated for nearly two months afterwards, *i.e.*

* For this letter, at length, see Jewell's Works, Parker Society, vol. iii., Part II., p. 1274. London: 1850.

† Thomas Lancaster had been Treasurer of Salisbury, and was consecrated Archbishop of Armagh, June 13th, 1568. A person of the same names had been consecrated, eighteen years previously, to the see of Kildare.—Loftus MSS. Marsh's Library, Dublin.

until the 13th of June. Yet, as a mere minister or priest, he had already been ordaining others ; and Jewell takes it for granted, that, like himself, Parker will regard all such ordinations—if a previous call has been made—as perfectly good and valid, though somewhat irregular ; and he does not for a moment declare them to be utterly null and void, as they certainly were. Does it not follow, therefore, as an obvious consequence, that the opinions then current in the new Church, and the lax practices then tolerated by its chief officers, prove that some at least of the leading “Reformed” prelates practically repudiated altogether the Catholic doctrine of ordination? If it had been otherwise—if the law on the subject had been then what the law now is—such a case as that of which Jewell makes mention would have been properly and severely dealt with. Yet how stands the question? This very man Lancaster, a Protestant, who had notoriously assumed episcopal duties without episcopal consecration, was not only not even reprimanded, but was soon afterwards consecrated Archbishop of Armagh, as if, in the case in question, nothing worthy of complaint or reprimand had occurred, or nothing out-of-the-way happened. Election by the people, from a Lutheran point of view, was regarded as an essential in the “making of ministers” ; the imposition of hands was held to be an ornamental

but useless addition.* In this conviction the above facts show that Archbishop Parker and Bishop Jewell were perfectly agreed.

Many of the bishops, it is evident, were adventurous self-seekers taken from the lowest of the people, or needy and impecunious gentlefolks, who, together with their property and old position, had lost their self-respect; and who, when their willingness to aid the innovators had been authoritatively made clear to the Council, were put into places of trust and importance to continue and consolidate the policy of change. They were too often keen and successful money-hunters, and willing tools of the Court. A large majority of these Reformation prelates, though constantly prating about the "Gospel" (as they termed their own immoral principles), were always sharply on the look-out for something more solid and less transcendental than the Calvinistic calcula-

* Luther taught that there were two kinds of calling to the office and work of the ministry; one, internal, from God, such as that of Prophets, Apostles, and Holy Teachers. The second, external, by the free election of the people, or by the selection and nomination of persons having authority, such as rulers and magistrates. The imposition of hands, with prayer, by some presiding minister, was a public indication to the congregation gathered together that the person had already been selected, and it was at the same time a ratification of the choice made. But it was no means of grace. The essential act was the selection, not the imposition of hands.

tions and phantasies in which they themselves professed to believe. There is scarcely one who is free from the charge of peculation, double-dealing, and self-aggrandizement.* Their whole energies seem to have been set on securing for themselves, their wives and families, every temporal advantage which could be had from their official positions, or squeezed out of the estates connected with them. From the days of William Barlow, "the calamity of his see," † as he was termed, to those of Bishop Pilkington, who robbed the diocese of Durham right royally, the same unchanging policy was pursued. Sometimes, as in the case of Aylmer, Bishop of London, and his

* Camden's "Annals," *in loco*.

† For an account of the disagreements between Sandys and Parker, see Petyt MSS., No. 47, folio 376, in which the former writes at length to the latter. Again: of the ruin wrought under William Barlow at Bath, Sir John Harington gives the following account from personal knowledge:—"I speak now only of the spoil made under this bishop, scarce were five years past after Bath's ruins; but as fast went the axes and hammers to work at Wells. The goodly hall covered with lead (because the roof might seem too low for so large a room), was uncovered, and now this roof reaches to the sky. The Chapel of Our Lady late repaired by Stillington, a place of great reverence and antiquity, was likewise defaced, and such was their thirst after lead (I would they had drunk it scalding) that they took the dead bodies of bishops out of their leaden coffins, and cast abroad the carcasses scarce thoroughly putrifid."—"Brief View of the State of the Church of England," p. 110.

immediate predecessor, they openly quarrelled amongst themselves over the temporalities, and so drew public attention to their selfish proceedings.

We may learn from what Strype and others have put on record, that the Queen was highly incensed on hearing that James Pilkington, Bishop Palatine of Durham,* had so managed to manipulate the revenues of that see, which he held for seventeen years, as to have been enabled to give a marriage portion of no less than ten thousand pounds to his daughter—an enormous sum in those days, equal in fact to that which the Queen herself had received from King Henry VIII. her father. “If the revenues be so mighty,” remarked Her Highness, “and the Crown be so poor, my lord of Durham† can surely spare Us a little. We will charitably lighten his heavy burden for him

* When this Puritan was a poor exile at Frankfort he is said to have consoled his afflicted and complaining fellows with “the heavenly promises of riches hereafter”—asserting that “few men were predestined to celestial joys who owned much money.”

† James Pilkington, born at Rivington, county Lancaster, in 1520, was third son of Richard Pilkington. He graduated B.A., Cantab., 1539; became Fellow of St. John’s, Cambridge, 26th of March 1539; M.A., 1542; B.D., 1550. He married Alice, daughter of Sir John Kingsmill, and died 23rd of January 1575, aged fifty-five, leaving his wife and two daughters as survivors. He was buried at Bishops Auckland, but afterwards removed to Durham.

somewhat." So, without process or further ado, she henceforth took one thousand pounds a year from the bishop's income, and devoted it to maintaining her garrison at Berwick.

Sandys and Grindal disagreed fiercely about dilapidations—which neither cared to pay for—and the forcible words and strong adjectives they both used in controversy on the subject were very remarkable. In a fierce dispute about a leasehold house at Battersea, which the Archbishops of York had frequently used when in London, the language uttered and written was both unprelatic and violent. Aylmer, too, was not a whit behind-hand either in the vigour of his words or in the grasping spirit he displayed. He and Sandys had so furious a public quarrel regarding the revenues due to either from the See of London upon Sandys' translation to York, that the Lord Treasurer, for decency's sake, was called in to appease it, but in vain. Tho' two prelates wrangled and snarled for some hours. Cecil as arbiter offended both, and satisfied neither. They continued to dispute for several years, and died engaged in tortuous lawsuits. In these, and in other particulars, their characters were certainly a little fly-blown.

The first wife of this man Edwin Sandys, sometime Bishop of Worcester, is said to have been his own niece or great-niece, the young and at-

tractive widow of one of the keepers of the Marshalsea prison, where, at the outset of his career, Sandys had been for some weeks confined. She was formally described as the daughter of "Master Sandys of Essex," and "a right buxom woman." But she died shortly after their illicit and uncanonical union; and he soon married another, thus piously consoling himself,—Cecilia, daughter of Sir Thomas Wilford.

In Worcestershire, Sandys acted with a very high hand. For example: On a visitation-tour, his attention was called to an old stone altar still standing in the parish church of Battenhall,* where the chief proprietor was Sir John Bourne, who had been Secretary of State under Queen Mary. Sandys ordered it to be "removed, defaced, and at once put to some common use." But Sir John and his allies resisted this injunction by force, so far as that when the altar-stone was pulled down he had it taken to his own mansion. Hearing of this, Sandys became impressively violent; ordered another visitation of the same village church to be held without delay; but, when an appeal was made to Archbishop Parker, as metropolitan, as to the need for such a step, Sandys was advised to be quiet and not push

* Some assert that this occurred at a parish in the city of Worcester.

matters to further extremities—advice which he appears reluctantly and not very good-temperedly to have taken.

Sir John Bourne, on the other hand, made a series of grave and disagreeable accusations against Sandys, some of which were certainly true enough* ; but, on an appeal to the Privy Council

* Amongst Sir John Bourne's charges against Bishop Sandys, are the following, given by Strype:—"That the manor house of Northwike (built in the beginning of Henry VII. his reign) he had already pulled down and razed from the bottom of the foundation; and having sold the hall, and the most part of the matter and stuff unto his friends, making thereof a great piece of money; with some part of the rest had raised at his palace a pretty building, which he called his *nursery*: to which it was also put, his wife being of good fecundity, and a very fruitful woman. And that for the furniture and finishing of the said nursery, he had likewise razed and pulled down a fair long vaulted chapel of stone, standing within his said palace. That his wife being thus fruitful, he had for one of his children procured, in his brother's name, one lease of the parsonage of Flodbury: which benefice was yearly worth four hundred marks, and better, being one of his own patronage, having a goodly mansion, and a goodly demeane: whereof was wont to be kept great hospitality."—Strype's "Annals," vol. i., Part II., pp. 38, 39. Oxford: 1824. Sir John Bourne likewise asserted that the pipes of a great pair of organs, which had cost two hundred pounds, had been melted down to make the prebendaries' wives dishes for their kitchens, and the organ-case had made them bedsteads; that the silver plate of the sacristy had been divided amongst the prebendaries, and that it was intended to divide the copes and other ornaments. The bishop, though evidently much annoyed that these and

(all of whom were disposed to defend and uphold the innovators at any cost, and who certainly had the power to do so), Bourne was condemned for having spoken disparagingly of Mistress Sandys and urged his retainers to do likewise, and committed to the Marshalsea. Subsequently, on retracting his sayings, he was released. But when invited to spend Christmas with the bishop, who, in this case, appears as a peace-maker, he threw the letter into the fire.* He continued to criticise the Protestant prelate and his lady very sharply, until the former was translated to London. At Worcester, Sandys was likewise accused of granting long leases of farms and lands belonging to the see to various poor Pro-

such-like reports should get abroad, admitted of his accuser that "none love him for himself, but for his religion many like him."—Strype's "Annals," vol. i., Part II., pp. 39–42.

* Bourne treated Sandys with contempt, as the bishop maintained. When after many contentions the latter invited Sir John and his lady to spend Christmas with him, he not only refused to come, but threw the letter into the fire. Sir John's eldest son had a special aversion to priests' and bishops' wives, which at that period was shared by many, and applied a term to them which certainly was strong, and not over polite. Sir John himself in this particular had equally offended, as the bishop averred, "Three women going through his park, wherein is a path for footmen, he, supposing they had been priests' wives, called unto them, 'Ye shall not come through my park, and no such priests' w—s.'"—Strype's "Annals," vol. i., Part II., pp. 24 and 30. Oxford: 1824.

testant relations, who had secured them for very low and inadequate rents. But inquiry on the subject was suppressed. When he went to London, with a like benevolent intention of doing good to the household of faith, more particularly his own, he attempted a similar policy ; but the Court, hearing of his contemplated proceedings, warned him in time that such tactics were not to be again attempted with impunity ; while the Lord Treasurer, in the name of the Chief Governess, rebuked him in very strong and vigorous Scripture-phrases. In London, Sandys was good enough to take under his special protection the Dutch Protestants in Austinfriars ; and on the other hand suppressed for awhile the Mass celebrated at the Portuguese ambassador's mansion in Tower Street—to which crowds had for some time resorted. He was translated to York on the 8th of March 1576 ; but, as he complained to the Lord Treasurer, was most coldly received* by the nobility and gentle-people on his arrival.

* Sandys could scarcely have looked for a very cordial greeting from the nobility and gentry of the Ancient Faith in Yorkshire, as he had thus described the ecclesiastical position in a sermon at York Minster : “ As Christ hath delivered all His out of the captivity of Satan and sin, so hath He also us, after a more special and peculiar manner, out of that den of thieves, out of that prison of Romish servitude, out of the bloody claws of that cruel and proud Antichrist.”—“ Sandys’

In May 1581, Sandys was holding a visitation at Doncaster; and contrary to the canons, went to an inn in the town, where he remained for some days for rest and refreshment. One midnight the wife of the innkeeper was found in His Grace's bed-chamber by her own husband.* The latter had returned home, as it appears, somewhat unexpectedly, and, seeking his spouse in vain in her own room, thus discovered her. Such a discovery of course required an explanation. It certainly had an awkward appearance. The noise which ensued disturbed other inmates of the hostel, amongst whom was a shrewd and popular Yorkshire knight, Sir Robert Stapleton, of Wighill,† who, at once taking in the situation, and for the honour of the Archbishop's cloth and dignity, is said to have endeavoured to prevent unnecessary

Works," p. 180, Parker Society. London: 1842. Grindal, on going to York to take up his new office seven years previously, had written to Sir W. Cecil to the same effect: "I was not received with such concourse of gentlemen, at my first coming into this shire, as I looked for." It is evident, therefore, that the "new cause" had not gained many adherents.

* For detailed particulars of this case, see Strype's "Annals," vol. iii., Book I., chap. ix., and Appendices Nos. 20 and 21. Also, "Biographical Notice of Sandys," by the Rev. John Ayre. Parker Society's Works. London: 1842.

† Sir Robert Stapleton, of Wighill, of an old Yorkshire family, was a connection of the ancient Catholic houses of Neville and Constable. For pedigree, see p. 333 of Foster's "Pedigrees of Yorkshire." London: 1875.

scandal. The excited host of the inn had gone so far as to threaten the exalted prelate with a taste of his unsheathed dagger, which he brandished again and again. But Stapleton interposed with earnestness and temporary success; for the Archbishop, who, if innocent, committed an unpardonable error of judgment, consented at once to give the innkeeper a considerable bag of golden angels to purchase his forgiveness and silence.* Subsequently other demands were made upon the unfortunate prelate under a threat of exposure,—to which both Stapleton and the injured husband, whether rightly or wrongly, are reported to have been parties. Such an incident in the case of so dignified a prelate, who had a wife of his own, of course afforded food for conversation and criticism in a very loose and dissolute Court when the news reached Richmond and Whitehall. The Queen and Leicester, evidently sympathising with the Archbishop, had the innkeeper brought up

* Sir John Harington asserts that the hostess had previously been Mistress Sandys' waiting-maid, and that on taking a candle to the bishop in bed, she "slipped into my lord's bed in her smock." Parsons, a contemporary writer, asserts that "this prelate had in his younger days been too familiar with this woman, which is said to pass as a venial sin with those of his profession."—"Brief View of the State of the Church of England," pp. 177-179.

to the Star Chamber for examination; and the evidence in detail was written out for Her Majesty's perusal and edification, Leicester directing Her Grace's attention to its more salient and striking points. The result was that the judges condemned the innkeeper to acknowledge the Archbishop's innocence at the York Assizes, which was formally done; but only amidst the jeers and contemptuous laughter of those who filled the court-house. For many months the Archbishop shut himself up at home. Several coarse squibs in prose and verse on this topic were secretly printed and hawked about the Castle-yard and Cathedral-close; while copies of two were affixed to the chief entrance of Bishopsthorpe Church—His Grace's parish—to the interest and amusement of the shrewd and observant Yorkshire rustics. Subsequently Sir Robert Stapleton, when found to be an adherent of the old religion, was confined in the Tower for nearly two years; because he declined either to vary from his original statement or to express regret for the charitable part which he had taken in a very questionable and unpleasant affair. Archbishop Sandys never recovered this blow.* According to

* On his monument in Southwell Minster this disagreeable event is unnecessarily commemorated. The Archbishop is said to have "suffered, from what the innocent mind can least of all endure—atrocious slanders."

his monument, he was soon afterwards translated to a better world.*

A few pages must now be devoted to Dr. John Bale,† one of the chief bishops of the Reformation-æra, and certainly one of the most outspoken

* The following, though vigorous and plain-spoken, is true:—"The 'Reformers' differed from each other, as widely as the colours of the rainbow, in most other things; but they all agreed in this, that good works were unnecessary to salvation, and that *the 'saints,' as they had the modesty to call themselves, could not forfeit their right to heaven by any sins however numerous and enormous.* By those, amongst whom plunder, sacrilege, adultery, polygamy, incest, perjury, and murder were almost as habitual as sleeping and waking; by those who taught that the way to everlasting bliss could not be obstructed by any of these, nor by all of them put together; by such persons, charity, besides that it was so well-known a Catholic commodity, would be, as a matter of course, set wholly at nought."—"History of the Protestant Reformation," by W. Cobbett, p. 189. Dublin: 1868.

† John Bale, a Suffolk man, first a Carmelite friar, was perverted to Protestantism, and then married a woman whose Christian name was Dorothy. As regards his perversion, Bishop Nicholson remarks that "his wife seems to have had a great hand in that happy work." He was patronized by Cromwell and Cranmer; and subsequently by Queen Elizabeth and Matthew Parker. Bale died, under Parker's rule and patronage, Prebendary of Canterbury, and was buried there in 1563. Though more coarse in his language than some others of the Reformers, he was a fair and faithful specimen of an outspoken and consistent Reformation-prelate. It is only just to the late Rev. Henry Christmas, D.C.L., to note that, when re-editing Bale's Works for the Parker Society, he left his conviction on record that certain of them "could not with propriety be presented to the public."

and plain-spoken. His name occurs in the commission for Dr. Parker's consecration; and, although, for some reason or another, he was not present on the occasion, it is evident that he was well known to the authorities and held in high estimation by them. He had been for some time Bishop of Ossory in Ireland; but found himself extremely unpopular in that Catholic land, where the unattractive Gospel of which he was a minister was wholly repudiated. So, as the income of the Irish see in question was very small, and his followers correspondingly so, Dr. Bale thought it prudent to turn his steps homewards, more especially when his family increased and his wife desired preferment for him in England.

His language was often unusually coarse, as will be seen from the specimens of it now to be given. He deals with the most sacred subjects in a spirit of virulence* and buffoonery—a spirit perfectly in harmony with certain of the doings of his allies and himself, but very much out of place in a minister of religion. He writes of the

* Pilkington of Durham was sometimes equally virulent:—"I will show you what is written in the life and history of Thomas Becket, Bishop of Canterbury, *their stinking martyr* and traitor to his prince."—"Pilkington's Works," p. 589, Parker Society's Works. London: 1842.

Catholic sacraments and sacred rites of the Universal Church in language so frightful, that many will find it difficult to believe that the profane author of such sentiments was in his right mind; while modern Anglicans may feel a little ashamed of owning him as a successor of the Apostles. His contemporaries, however, were well enough pleased with him, and his writings do not appear to be out of harmony with the official "Homilies" which had been recently issued. For Parker secured him the place of a prebendary at Canterbury; consulted him on several occasions, and sometimes used his services in preaching, confirming, and visiting certain churches in the diocese.

The following are his sentiments concerning priestly ordination, and the Sacrament of the Eucharist:—

"As touching the priests' consecration, which is such a charm of enchantment which may not be done but by an oiled officer of the Pope's generation; . . . for in all the Bible it is not that any man can make a dry wafer-cake a new Saviour, a new Redeemer, a new Christ, or a new God: no, though he should utter all the words and Scriptures therein."*

* "Works of Bishop Bale," pp. 232-233, Parker Society's Publications. London: 1849.

Of the same adorable sacrament this impious "Reformer" likewise writes:—

The Mass "serveth all witches in their witchery, all sorcerers, charmers, enchanters, dreamers, soothsayers, necromancers, conjurors, cross-diggers, devil-raisers, miracle-doers, dog-leeches, and bawds; for without a Mass they cannot well work their feats."*

The old clergy, legitimate successors of Saint Augustine, Saint Anselm, and William of Wykham, he calls, "puffed-up porklings of the Pope"†: and again writes:—

"These were the idle priests at London and their beastly ignorant broods, with old superstitious bawds and brothels, the Pope's blind cattle."

Of preaching-clergy of the old order of things he is equally abusive:—

"Let beastly blind babblers and bawds, with their charming chaplains, then, prate at large out of their malicious spirit and idle brains."‡

The Church Universal is—

"The Madam of mischief and proud Synagogue of Satan."

And the Catholic bishops are—

"Those two-horned whoremongers, those conjurors of

* "Bale's Works," p. 236.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 242 and 249.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 245.

Egypt, and lecherous locusts, leaping out of the smoke of the pit bottomless.”*

The “communion of saints,” according to this apostate Carmelite, is the—

“Proud Synagogue of Satan, with gold, silver, pearl, precious stones, velvets, silks, mitres, copes, crosses, cruetts, ceremonies, censurings, blessings, babblings, brawlings, processions, puppets, and such other mad masteries, (whereof the Church that Christ left here behind Him knew not one jot,) to provoke the carnal idiots to her whoredom in the spirit.”†

No fanatic who ever put pen to paper could possibly outstrip in coarseness the following episcopal blasphemy; never repudiated by any authority in the new Church, and recently re-published for the edification of those who are charmed with and attracted towards Bale’s religion.

“Who ever heard of so great a wonder that a dry cake should become a God to be worshipped? . . . they will take upon them to create (Him) every day afresh, and when

* “Bale’s Works,” p. 259. He may be fairly matched by Dr. Walter Haddon, in his reply to Jerome Osorius, a Portuguese, who wrote thus of the outcast English monks and nuns—“It was provided by laws that the sows should not again wallow in such filthy mire.”—Strype’s “Annals,” vol. i., Part II., p. 74. Oxford: 1824.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 259, 260.

their old God stinketh in the box, remove Him out of the way, and put a new in His room.”*

Finally,—for it is impossible to quote much which he wrote, and which his modern admirers have thought it decent to reproduce,—he declares, in language borrowed from the Apocalypse and most blasphemously misapplied, that the Catholic Church is a “great whore,” “a stinking strumpet.”† “She is,” he goes on to maintain, “in like case flourishingly decked with gold, precious stones, and pearls, not only in her manifold kinds of ornaments, as in her copes, corporasses,‡ chasubles, tunicles, stoles, fanons, and mitres, but also in mystery of counterfeit godliness.” “Their shavelings of prodigious beastliness in lecherous living, [live] under the colour of chastity.”§

The bishops, as cannot fail to be remarked, were all most obsequious and obedient to the

* “Bale’s Works,” p. 283.

† *Ibid.*, p. 494.

‡ The Reformers had always much disliked these. Bishop Hooper had asked, Anno 1552, “whether the Communion be used in such place and after such sort, as most varieth from, and is most distant from the Popish Mass, and whether they use any *corporas cloth* in the Communion?”—Hooper’s “Interrogatories.”

§ “Bale’s Works,” p. 497.

Queen* ; and at all times dutifully and faithfully regarded the Crown as the source of all their authority, and the fountain of their jurisdiction—as Parliament had decreed. They thus most thoroughly understood their true position, frankly accepted it, and do not appear to have ever desired any change ;—save, of course, that all of them looked to become archbishops, (it was only in human nature to do so,) while the Archbishop of York for the time being, no doubt, expected in due course to be translated to Canterbury. Their new Oath of Homage, taken by each one and every one on his knees before Her Highness, has already been referred to. It behoved them, therefore, never to forget her to whom they owed all that they were, or might be, in dignity, rank, office, and state—the Queen. On the whole, it must be ungrudgingly admitted that their memories were tolerably faithful and did not often fail.

As examples of their profound subservience to

* Bishop Sandys was particularly laudatory of Elizabeth. Here are his words :—“ Did God ever bless the throne of any man as He hath done the royal seat of His anointed this day? Hath the like ever been heard of in any nation to that which in ours is seen? Our Deborah hath mightily repressed the rebel Jaben ; our Judith hath beheaded Holofernes, the sworn enemy of Christianity ; our Hester hath hanged up that Haman which sought to bring both us and our children into miserable servitude.”—“ Sandys’ Works,” p. 81, Parker Society. London : 1842.

the Supreme Governness, it may be here recorded that Parker and Grindal, in 1561, humbly approached the Queen, for letters “to authorize the now Bishop of Hereford to visit the same church from time to time as occasion shall serve.”*

Thus none of them presumed to do anything whatsoever which involved the exercise of jurisdiction, without having first sought permission from the only person in whom it was now supposed to be vested.

Three years later, that is, in March 1564, the Queen issued a dispensation,† on the humble petition of the Warden of Winchester College, abolishing Wednesday as a fast day in that venerable institution,—for with Her Majesty it now lay to undertake all which the Primate of Christendom, since the days of St. Augustine, had by right of his office and dignity hitherto done for this island. She could grant licenses, dispensations and graces; for, to quote the Bidding Prayer, she was “in all causes, and over all persons, both civil and ecclesiastical, in these her dominions, supreme.”

When, therefore, some years afterwards, Grindal, who had so faithfully proclaimed the “prin-

* 13th March 1561.—State Paper Office.

† Parker MSS., C. C. C. Camb., No. cxiv. p. 547.

ciples of the Reformation,"* resigned his archbishoprick, A.D. 1583, he properly resigned it

* Judging from what was stated at Caldmore, near Walsall, on August 11th, 1879, by Colonel Bagnall, the diocese of York still bears the impress of "the principles of the Reformation." This quotation is from one of the organs of the Ritualists:—"Referring to the Rev. S. F. Green's case at Miles Platting, he said that Mr. Green was accused of cleansing the chalice at Holy Communion; but, remarked the speaker, no notice was taken of cases where the commonest decencies were neglected, where the vessels and other appointments of the altar were treated with neglect and disrespect; in reference to which the Colonel remarked, he was with Mr. Bailey at an old ancient church on the Wolds in the diocese of York, where the altar and appointments were allowed to fall into a disgraceful condition. For the altar was a common deal table, covered with an old baize cloth, the colour of which was probably originally green, but by long use the original colour could not then be well ascertained. Upon the table were bits of plaster fallen from the ceiling, and dust abounded. By the appearance of the church he should believe it was not cleaned from Sunday to Sunday, except on a few occasions for christenings, &c. This was a church at least eight hundred years old, and still retained some marks of its former grandeur, but now we may well exclaim: 'Ichabod, Thy glory has departed!' In the vestry, on the chimney-piece, they found a short clay pipe, ashes, &c. In the church itself they thought they smelt a disagreeable odour, and looking about, they found an old cupboard which contained dirty rags, and a chalice with the stains of wine still upon it. He should like to ask if this state of things would suit Lord Penzance? There was not under these circumstances representations made to Bishops or Archbishops in consequence of this gross neglect. But when a clergyman, actuated by faith, strove to celebrate the Holy Eucharist with order and that reverence due to the great mystery, he was persecuted and prosecuted."

into the hands of the Queen, the fountain of spiritual authority in the new Church, as the following extract from his formal instrument declares:—"Purè, spontè, simpliciter, et absolutè, in manus excellentissimæ ac illustrissimæ in Christo principis et Dominæ, Elizabethæ, Dei gratiâ Angliæ, Franciæ et Hiberniæ Reginæ, etc. cujus singulari favore et benignitate dictum archiepiscopatum consecutus sum, resigno." Between himself and his spiritual Master, Jesus Christ, there only stood one person, and that person was Queen Elizabeth.

Some idea in detail of the state of the various dioceses of England at different periods during Elizabeth's reign* must now be given from the words of her new prelates themselves, and others, otherwise the Pope's action might appear too severe. As regards that of Durham, in the north,

* In 1571 there was a Communion only once a quarter in every parish church, with a sermon an hour long. For servants and officers it began at five o'clock in the morning, and ended at eight; for masters, gentry, and dames another commenced at nine, with a like sermon to end at twelve. "The people," as may be read, "do orderly arise from their pews, and so pass to the Communion-table, where they receive the Sacrament; and from thence in like order to their place; having all this time a minister in the pulpit, reading unto them comfortable scriptures of the Passion or other pertaining to the matter in hand."—Strype's "Annals," vol. ii., Part I., pp. 134, 135. Oxford: 1834.

let Dr. Pilkington in a plain-spoken letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury first tell his own story:—

“It is too lamentable,” he writes, concerning one of his chief towns, Blackburn, “to see and hear how negligently they say any service there, and how seldom. . . . The old vicar of Blackburn, Roger Linney, resigned for a pension, and now, A.D. 1564, Whalley has as evil a vicar as the worst; and there is one come thither that has been deprived, and changes his name, and now teaches school there, of evil to make them worse.”*

Archbishop Parker, in writing to Lord Burghley gave a terrible account of the state of Norwich Cathedral, in the east of England. The discipline appears to have been equally bad†; and the same is supported by local records. The church was an utter desolation. It had long ago been cleared of everything valuable,—ornaments,

* MSS. C. C. Coll., Camb., No. cxiv. p. 519.

† Fr. Nesse, of the diocese of Norwich, caused his own vexation. He was reported to be of “troubled and disordered behaviour.” So the bishop rebuked him by a letter dated February 25th, 1572, and threatened him with a legal process if he did not mend his manners. He had for some time a great preacher of the new evangel, but the bishop looks upon him as “slanderous”—because he had married, but “frequented a suspected house.”

service-books, lamps, vestments, and tapestry. The rain came in from the roof, partly stripped of its lead, the walls were sodden; the pictured glass of the windows broken, so that the wind whistled round transepts, ambulatory, and chapels; the font was thrown down; the monuments in the various chantries were in course of destruction. "The church is miserable," are the Archbishop's exact words. It "hath but six beneficiaries; and but one of them at home, both needy and poor, of which some of those I know to be Puritans. Chapman of late displaced by the Bishop of Lincoln; Johnson coming abroad, with his four several prebends (as they say) in new-erected churches, both against statute and his oath." There was no daily service, either in cathedral or parochial church: a mere "reader" read out Mattins and Evensong once a week, and kept the parish registers.* Communion was celebrated only three times a year; no sermon had been preached in the cathedral for nine

* The readers, formally set apart, in some way but by no public, authorized, and legal form, "were to preach, administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, baptize; but to read the Common Prayers and keep the registers. They were taken out of the laity, together with others; any that was of sober conversation and good behaviour, and that could read and write." "Annals," vol. i. p. 516. Oxford: 1824.

her,
to
or
ie
or
st
's

previously, and none of the people of the city apparently cared to attend* for “the common prayer sayd only on the Sundaies.” The prebendaries, with a single exception, were away, their houses dilapidated; the deanery of Norwich was vacant. Of the late dean of the cathedral and of the bishop of the diocese Parker indirectly and vaguely, but forcibly remarked:—“I have been of late shamefully deceived by some young men, and so have I been by some older men.”†

At St. Saviour’s Church in that city, all organs and singing having been abolished, and the minister having taken to reading the Sunday prayers from a new pulpit in the nave,—as Parkhurst had enjoined,—some of the parishioners were exceedingly displeased. One, Thomas Lynn,‡ so far resented this innovation, that he appeared in the church with some “cunning queristers,” as some say—or with “three or four lewd boys,

* The cathedral was not singular in this respect, for it is on record that “many were now wholly departed from the communion of the church, and came no more to hear Divine Service in the parish churches, nor received the Holy Sacrament according to the law of the realm. This was especially taken notice of in the diocese of Norwich.”—Strype’s “Annals,” vol. ii., Part. I., p. 161. Oxford: 1824.

† Lansdowne MSS., British Museum, No. xvii. folio 58.

‡ Strype’s “Annals,” vol. ii., Part I., p. 328. Oxford: 1824.

set on by some lewder persons,"—as they were described by others, and, when the parson facing the people preached the *Magnificat* like a sermon, they, on their part, "chanted it out loudly, after the auncient mode."

The Bishop, Dr. John Parkhurst, was a strong and irreverent Puritan; and seems to have been always on the side of the Protestant innovators. Anything approaching to what he impiously called "the clouted Popish mass" his unrighteous soul abhorred. When the tressels and Communion-board were brought down for "the Lord's Supper," he forbad its being decked like an altar; or the retention of any rites by the presiding minister, which might in any way recall the ancient Sacrifice.* The sign of the Cross he also forbad, as well as any washing of the Communion-

* These were the Bishop's express and formal directions:—*"Item, that they neither suffer the Lorde's table to be hanged and decked like an aulter, neyther use any gestures of the popish masse in the time of ministracion of the Communion, as shifting of the booke, washing, breathing, crossing, or such-like."*—Injunctions of John Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, A.D. 1561." And, again, eight years later:—"At such times as ye shall use the perambulation in the *Rogation* dayes for the boundes of your parish, you shall not use any surplis uppon you, or stay at any crosse, or suffer any banners to be carried, or other superstition to be used."—Injunctions of Bishop John Parkhurst, A.D. 1569. London: John Walley.

cup after its use. If any minister went forth for a perambulation at Rogation-tide, he was to go without surplice, and to stop at no wayside cross. Nor was any banner to be carried. On taking possession of his episcopal seat, he allowed anyone, apparently, who, in his own estimation, could preach and proclaim the new gospel—though “not bred to learning,” a trader, or even a husbandman—to officiate in the parish churches of his diocese. Fanaticism, ignorance, and presumption were, with him, sure tokens of election and grace. At Cotessey, near Norwich, a “love-feast” was held in the chancel, the Communion-board of which served as the table of the profane entertainment, round which the elect sat,—an entertainment which ended in scandals too shocking for any detailed description.*

In the city of Norwich the Calvinists and Zwinglians from Flanders had a church apportioned to them, and Parkhurst took them under his protection. The three ministers were named Anthonius, Theophilus, and Isbrandus. Neither was superior to the other two, yet in controversy each wanted to have the first word, the last retort, and the final triumph. They quarrelled

* MS. letter in the possession of the Author from the Collections of the Very Rev. F. C. Husenbeth, D.D.

violently, and their respective adherents came to blows. "Falling in their sermons upon particular doctrines controverted amongst themselves, [they] preached so earnestly in answers and confutations one of another, that the congregation was all in confusion, and the peace of the church broken up."* When the Bishop interfered, they would not obey, laughing him to scorn, and openly defying his authority.

It will cause no surprise, therefore, that Sir William Cecil, when writing to Parker on the 12th of August 1561, declared that "the Bishop of Norwich is blamed even of the best sort for his remissness in ordering his clergy. He winketh at schismatics and anabaptists, as I am informed. Surely I see great variety in ministration. A surplice may not be borne here. And the ministers follow the folly of the people, calling it charity to feed their fond humour. Oh! my Lord, what shall become of this time?"†

* Strype's "Annals," vol. ii., Part II., p. 174. Oxford: 1824.

† Petyt MSS., No. 47, folio 372, in the Inner Temple. In Parkhurst's Visitation Articles for 1661, under the head of "The People and theyr Duetie," he seems active enough against the innovators, and asks "whether any man is known to have said or heard masse, sithens it was abrogate by lawe; and whether any man maketh any singing cakes to say masse withal, reserveth vestments, superaltaries, massebookes, or other instruments of this supersticion?"—Injunctions. Printed by John Day, 1561.

With all such laxity of discipline, however, some hundreds of parishes in the eastern portion of the country remained wholly unserved.

In the year 1563, in the Archdeaconry of Norwich for example, there were no less than eighty vacant benefices ; in the Archdeaconry of Norfolk one hundred and eighty-two ; in the Archdeaconry of Suffolk one hundred and thirty ; in the Archdeaconry of Sudbury forty-two. In addition to these there had been a large number of chapels “standing so ruinous a long time, that now they were quite taken down.”*

In the diocese of Carlisle, to go back again northwards, a similar state of affairs existed. The destroyers had done their work only too well. Every rapacious “reformer” had gained his point. The altars had been overthrown and broken down, the chalices and pixes stolen—either legally or otherwise—and the Old Religion utterly cast out. No one could be obtained, however,—judging from Archbishop Grindal’s complaint to Sir William Cecil,—to preach the new gospel :—

“The Bishop of Carlisle (John Best) hath often complained to me for want of preachers for his diocese, having no help at all of his cathedral

* Strype’s “Annals,” vol. i. p. 539. Oxford: 1824.

church. Sir Thomas Smith is his Dean, occupied in the Queen's Majesty's affairs, as ye know. All his prebendaries . . . are ignorant priests, or old, unlearned monks."*

Again, about the year 1565, in the diocese of Bangor, then presided over by Dr. Rowland Meyrick, the new gospel was evidently making but little, if any, progress, and the salutary practice of good works even less. "Many of the churches be utterly closed." "Therein there be neither Word nor Sacraments." The Bishop, though a Welshman, was very unpopular, except with the laxest and most immoral of the preachers, for he seems to have been sorely intent on both contemplating and grasping things temporal. For spiritual concerns he showed but little interest. He is reported to have been cringing and abject to his superiors, always lazy and indolent, and most pompous, overbearing, and tyrannical to those beneath him. His lordship was evidently more indebted to the new religion than the new religion was to him. This diocese, it is put on record, is "much out of order," "having no preaching there, and pensionary concubinage openly continued."†

* Lansdowne MSS., British Museum, No. vi. folio 86. Grindal to Cecil, 27th December, 1563.

† *Ibid.*, No. viii. folio 78.

Nor was the extensive diocese of Lichfield apparently more favoured. It suffered, as the bishop himself admitted, "lamentable inconveniences growing to the Church of God by the insufficient ministry."* The new gospel, which the old clergy secretly hated and despised, had not as yet shed many blessings upon the cruelly-robbed people in that part of the Queen's dominions; nor could its religious state compare with what it had been in the previous century.

On June 11, 1581, Dr. William Overton, bishop of that see, had, he asserted, the stubbornest diocese in all this land, and a clergy the most unwilling to show themselves ready and dutiful in any good service, specially if it touched their purse.†

The chief church of Coventry had been long ago efficiently "reformed." The "robbers of churches" had gathered in bands and flocks, and had there left little worth taking. Some writers

* "To help the lamentable inconveniences growing to the Church of God by the insufficient ministry, they are not only to be sifted which are already made ministers, but also a diligent care and foresight is to be used that only sufficient men be admitted to that function hereafter."—Certain "Advertisements" by William Overton, Bishop of Coventry, A.D. 1584.

† Vide "State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth," vol. cxlix. p. 18.

have laid this and similar acts of destruction to the charge of those who, in the succeeding century, sided with the usurping ruffian Oliver Cromwell. But it was certainly effected under Edward VI. and Elizabeth. Everything of great value in the shape of gold or silver plate, jewels, MSS., and rich vestments had long ago vanished under the rule of Protector Somerset. The vessels of latten, brass, and white metal—all savouring of superstition—had already been devoutly stolen, so that no one might henceforth sin by using them. Several of the bells and much of the lead had been removed. The rafters and roof-boards of aisles and chantries had rotted; rain sometimes poured in on to the pavement; in the spring birds built their nests above the wall-plates; in the winter the aisles and side chapel-floors were flooded with water; while green lichen and weeds soon grew luxuriantly on their walls. Certain of the chapels were thus partially roofless. Yet even then some adventurous Gospeller, with a sham Commission, a mere poor gleaner in a harvest field once rich, came and stole all the remaining brass.*

* "The pavement of Coventry Church is almost all tombstones, and some very ancient. But there came in a zealous fellow, with a counterfeit Commission, that, for avoiding of superstition, hath not left one pennyworth, nor one penny-

A few words may now be written as to the diocese of Oxford—one of the new sees. Henry VIII. had intended to have had it styled the “Bishoprick of Osney and Thame”—after two important religious houses in Oxfordshire which had been suppressed. But the abbey-churches of Osney and Thame were soon both destroyed; while the parish church of Thame—though of prebendal rank, and a cruciform and dignified building of considerable size for its purpose—was inadequate. So, in 1546, the bishoprick had a seat appointed to it in the priory church of St. Frideswide, now Christ Church, Oxford. From the death of Robert King,—who for some time had been Abbot of Thame, with the title of Bishop of Rheon, and was one of the suffragans of the Bishop of Lincoln,—a death which had taken place in the last year of Queen Mary’s reign, until the year 1567, the see of Oxford had been kept vacant; so that its revenues might be utilized in serving the Queen’s friends or bribing her enemies. On the 14th of October of the last-named year Dr. Hugh Curwen, sometime Archbishop of Dublin, who, like other of the

breadth, of brass upon the tombs of all the inscriptions, which had been many and costly.”—“Brief View of the State of the Church,” by Sir John Harington, p. 85. London: 1653.

Protestant prelates, had not been at all appreciated in Ireland, was appointed to the see of Oxford; but he died within a year of his enthronization. It then remained unfilled for the long period of nearly twenty-one years, when Dr. John Underhill was consecrated on the 14th of December 1589. The poverty of this see; the actual difficulty of living; the misery of many of the burdened clergy; the notable fact that more than one hundred and ninety benefices had been unserved for nearly a quarter of a century, and that the country people, some not baptized, were untaught, unfed, and often buried without Christian rites, depressed his lordship so seriously that, within two years and a half, in a state of incurable melancholy, he took to his bed, and passed to his final account. So that the episcopal seat in this new cathedral of Our Blessed Lady and St. Frideswide was filled for little more than three out of forty-six years. The Spiritual Governness had given its lands and revenues to her favourite, the Earl of Leicester; after whose death Lord Essex secured them for himself. Both these noblemen so spoiled and wasted them, that there was nothing left to later bishops but impropriations and a dilapidated mansion in St. Aldate's, at Oxford. So devastated was this and other new sees, in truth, that the bishops were actually obliged to solicit pecuniary aid from the rectors

and vicars of their respective dioceses to enable them to furnish their episcopal residences.

Within a single century of Queen Elizabeth's death, those who admire her vigorous policy will learn with satisfaction and thankfulness that, whether true or false, good or bad, the Old Religion had been thereabouts almost entirely rooted and stamped out. Judging from a "Return of the Popish Recusants for the County and City of Oxford" made in 1706,* they might then be easily numbered. A mere handful, no one could pretend to fear them. Mr. Nathaniel Bevan, Vicar of North Aston, officially reported that one Sutton, "supposed to be the priest," "reads Mass in my parish most Sundays and holidays." At Somerton, twenty-seven remained of whom the Vicar wrote: "We have probable grounds to believe that they meet sometimes for their service in a house in the parish; but they are civil, quiet, and peaceable." At Whitchurch there was only one—Esquire Hyde. At another parish there were "two old women only." At North Leigh, near Blenheim Park, "Mary Morris, wife of a day labourer," was the sole representative of the religion of William of Wykeham. At Burford "Elizabeth Haines, a poor sojourner; no other."

* To be seen in the Diocesan Registry at Oxford.

At Checkendon there was a family of the name of Grimsditch who were Catholics. At Sandford Esquire Powell and his dependents likewise clung to the Ancient Faith; as did the Earl and Countess of Kildare at Caversham, together with the knightly family of the Curzons of Waterperry, and a few more. However persons may shrink from approving the policy of Elizabeth's advisers, they cannot deny that, by the aid of fine, imprisonment, knife, halter, and torture-chamber, it thus turned out a complete and triumphant success; for the solitude had been made, the peace was secured. With some persons—the selfish and the shallow—success is a certain test of truth.

The actual state of affairs in the diocese of St. David's, likewise, may be tolerably well gleaned from certain "Injunctions to be observed and kept,"* issued to the clergy of his diocese by Middleton, bishop of that see in 1583. Judging them from a Christian standing-point, it is not easy to determine whether their heresy or profanity be their most notable feature.

This man, Marmaduke Middleton, a person remarkable for nothing in particular, had been

* The original of these, printed in 1583, can be seen in a large and curious collection of such documents in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

made Bishop of Waterford, in Ireland, in 1579, by Letters Patent. No canonical election had ever taken place, and there seems to be some doubt whether he had ever received episcopal consecration of any sort or kind.* Four years afterwards, like other Protestant prelates, who had laboured in vain, if they had laboured at all, he found that Ireland was no fitting place for him, as the gospel he proclaimed was there repudiated with scorn; so, after the death of Richard Davies, Bishop of St. David's, on November 7, 1581, he begged for that vacated see, and in the following year, with Burghley's sanction, was appointed to it. Within twelve months he issued a large series of Visitation Articles, or Injunctions, from which much exact information may be gained as to his actual goings-on. He persecuted with vigour those who clung to the Old Faith; he was a profound, intelligent, and obsequious Erastian; he destroyed several churches and built none; and at the end of ten years was called to his account.

These "Injunctions" are worthy of careful study. They contain his lordship's sage and mature directions, and are quite free from any taint

* It is only fair to the late Archdeacon Cotton to state that he believed himself to be in possession of indirect evidence of Middleton's consecration. See also, on the other side, "The Episcopal Succession," &c. by Dr. Maziere Brady, vol. i. p. 351. Rome: 1876.

of superstition. In the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, trine immersion and trine affusion were each distinctly forbidden by them. No chrisom-cloth was to be used; the godfathers were not allowed to touch the child's head as heretofore; for Bishop Middleton, as he was careful to explain, discountenanced the ancient but erroneous idea that there was any "virtue or hidden mystery" in baptism; and desired, as a godly exercise, in the new method of baptizing, that all young sponsors should "saie the whole Catechisme," and "make an open confession at the font of the Articles of their faith," before assuming that office and duty. Lay-baptism he distinctly forbade.

All the old ceremonies of the Mass, and especially consecration, were likewise distinctly forbidden. The minister was neither to handle, bless, lift up, consecrate, nor show to the people, the Bread and Wine, but to "let it lie upon the table until the distribution thereof." He was to act exactly "according to the orders of the Book [of Common Prayer] without any addition or detraction." In this, of course, the manual actions had been deliberately omitted.* No one

* This omission, perfectly intentional, was entirely in harmony with the opinions of Elizabeth's bishops, who had adopted the Second Prayer Book.

was under any circumstances to remain either in church or chancel, unless an actual communicant, prepared then and there to communicate; for this likewise savoured of the "abominable and vain" custom of hearing Mass; and, if any stubborn or obstinate person kneeling on his knees, knocking his breast, or devoutly saying his prayers, proposed to do so, and would not depart, when quietly ordered out of church, the presiding minister was, with no consideration for the expectant or the hungry, to stop the whole proceedings at once without further ado, and then summon the "troublers of God's divine service"—the ignorant person who, believing in the efficacy of prayer, prayed—before the Judge of the local Consistory Court.

The officiating parson himself was enjoined to stand always in the "bodie of the church, or in the lower end of the chancel, with his face invariably turned unto the people." Turnings about were solemnly discountenanced. The use of a low voice or mumbling,—as it was contemptuously called,—was expressly forbidden. The "mass-mongers" had mumbled; so by way of contrast the minister was expected to bellow or bawl. He was to use a loud voice, or as loud as he could make it,—for "faith cometh by hearing,"*

* This text was actually quoted as a justification for shouting out the prayers.

and never to go near the Communion-board, unless there was an actual Communion; for such custom,—to use the Bishop's own profane language—"doth retain a memorie of the idolatrous Masse."* To avoid even the appearance of anything so heinous, during the ante-Communion service, he was to stand in his own seat or pulpit and nowhere else, "with his face turned down towards the people"; and he was, moreover, to take special care that the board and tressels remained wholly unadorned, in their plain and severe simplicity. No linen cloth was to be laid upon the Communion-table, and no other covering ordinarily; and, when the tressels and board were done with, when the ante-Communion prayers were ended, or when the sacred meal was over, they were to be removed "to the upper end of the raised chauncell."

Again, when any woman gave thanks to God for her safe delivery, neither she, when making her offering, nor the midwife who accompanied her, were "to kiss the Communion boarde,"—a very old Catholic custom, common in many parts of England, of old; and almost universal abroad.

* This custom was almost universal throughout England up to the period of the commencement of the Oxford movement, except perhaps in cathedrals and colleges. Thus chancels, when large and long, often stood disused and deserted.

As regards ceremonials at funerals—those expressive rites which the Church of God had ever made so solemn and hallowing, blessing and benefiting all who took part in them—no hand-bell was henceforth to be rung throughout the diocese of St. David, no oblations were to be offered, “no prayers for the dead were to be made”—the exact words of this episcopal heretic are quoted—“either in the house or upon the way, or elsewhere”: practices which, it appears, had been too frequently and universally tolerated by the clergy of this diocese up to the time of Middleton’s unwelcome arrival. Month’s minds or year’s minds were absolutely prohibited. All “Popish superstition” was to be given up. A practice of the communion of saints was thus authoritatively forbidden and cast out. Again: if strange ministers came to pay their respects to the memory of a departed Welshman, they were not to array themselves in any rochets or surplices, nor to carry lighted candles or torches, nor to place any wax tapers on or near the corpse whilst it was in the church. If they prayed at all, they were to pray not for the person departed but for themselves—a form of selfishness peculiarly repulsive on such an occasion. A short peal was to be rung both before and after the funeral; and then the people were to depart without adding any ancient Catholic prayers of their own, or anything

which resembled them. Wooden crosses were not to be erected, as had been so long the custom, and was common, where the corpse had rested on its way to its last earthly home; and the putting-up of "crosses of wood" in the churchyard "upon or about the grave" was also distinctly forbidden. Hence, until quite recent times, no cross was ever found placed at the head of a grave. Almost all churchyard crosses were broken; though sometimes the shaft remained.

Moreover (and here the actual words are quoted), "Images, pictures, and al monuments of fained miracles, as well in walles, as in glasse windowes, [shall] be defaced; and namely [*i.e.* particularly] the Image of the Crucifixe* and the two Maries in the chauncell windowes." Pictures of the Queen herself, together with gorgeous representations of Her Majesty's heraldic achievement, were alone allowed by way of internal decorations. Later on,—when Christian sacraments had been dragged down to the level of Jewish types of the same,—representations of Moses and Aaron were admitted. All rood-screens, likewise, were to be pulled down.

* It has always seemed to the author quite an incomprehensible mystery why these "Reformers" displayed so Satanic a hatred of the Crucifix and of representations of the Crucifixion.

With regard to questions of living, morals, and theological duties, it was enjoined that those ministers who had previously kept inns, taverns, or "victualling houses," were to give them up, learn to read better and more intelligibly, and stick to the study of Bullinger's "Decades" or the published "Homilies," which were so plain-spoken, spirited, and impressive; nor were these ministerial worthies—who, never having themselves learnt, were now commissioned to teach—ever to play at dice, cards, tables, or bowls. Four times a year, with a loud voice and impressive manner, they were to read out in church the "Queen's Majestie's Injunctions." They were, furthermore, to possess no books of divinity except such as had been specially recommended and approved by their bishop; nor was any man to have two wives, or any woman to have two husbands—one of his lordship's most practical and important provisions—for gross looseness of morals had too speedily followed upon misbelief and grave laxity of doctrine.

From Wales let us now pass to Lincolnshire, the chief part of one of the most important dioceses of England.

The old diocese of Lincoln, then as now, embraced more than one county and a large tract of land, perhaps but sparsely populated. It took in the whole of the central part of eastern England,

from Barton-upon-Humber and Great Grimsby in the north, to Crowland and Market Deeping in the south, with the Isle of Axholme and the county of Nottingham. As early as the reign of William Rufus, St. Remigius, the devoted Bishop of Dorchester-upon-Thame in Oxfordshire, had, for good and sufficient reasons, removed his see from a sacred spot, well wooded and watered, where the junction of two ancient rivers is made, to a fortified place in the north-east—the present ancient and interesting city of Lincoln. St. Hugh the Carthusian, and Alexander the Munificent, by their charitable labours, had each left their impress upon the devout and reverent people under them; while those parts of Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire which in previous generations had perhaps owned Dorchester as their mother-church, henceforth turned to the important see of Lincoln, as a child turns to its parent, for guidance and aid.

That City itself must have been once fair and beautiful in the sight of God and the Holy Angels; for there, independent of the glorious and richly-furnished Cathedral of Our Lady and St. Hugh, which towered over weald and wold, no less than fifty-two parish churches,* with all their efficient machinery—their rich altars and

* Now there are but fifteen.

lighted lamps, their means of grace for the unregenerate, and their Angel's Food for the pious wayfarer—stood around and about that majestic sanctuary, calling people by open door and pleasant chime to worship and prayer, and silently reminding them ever of the unseen world, its beauty and its peace.

Throughout the shire, all around, northward, eastward and westward,—dotted here and there amid clumps of trees, or where willows marked out the tortuous way of some sluggish stream, or nestling under some green slope,—rose spire or tower or stunted bell-cote of many a village fane. Throughout Lincolnshire, prior to the sixteenth-century changes, no less than a hundred and eight religious houses had long been centres of light and life to a people who appreciated and valued them. Of these the more celebrated were the abbeys of Barlings and Bardney, Swineshead and Croyland, with the notable priory of Sempringham, where St. Gilbert had so often prayed.

The Knights Templars had owned five houses, which were suppressed and destroyed; while no less than fourteen hospitals, where the corporal works of Mercy had long been charitably practised to the great benefit of the poor, shared a similar fate. Those who had been subservient to King Henry VIII., those who in the succeeding reign had actively supported Protector Somerset and

his policy, and those who later on were secret and sure allies of Cecil and Walsingham, had secured a considerable share of the various spoils. Such gained a few things here, if they lost more hereafter. Many ancient families, impoverished by the disastrous Wars of the Roses, to their eternal shame, consented to acquiesce in the unhappy changes carried out, on condition of being allowed to participate in the lands and manors stolen from the religious communities.

Under Edward VI., much, as is well known, had been done in many parts of England to strip the parish churches of their ornaments and treasures. On the 15th of February 1549, Commissioners had been despatched in all directions to find out exactly what still existed of value and to take inventories of the same. Two years afterwards, other commissions were issued to do a similar work; and, again, two years later, in May 1553, a fresh set of Inquisitors was sent about to different dioceses on a like errand. These Commissioners were even then most unpopular.

The people in general were Catholic, and saw with horror and dismay the churches of the Most High plundered, desecrated, and utterly destitute of any kind of religious worship or service.* The

* "Great endeavours were also made in this Synod for the mending the poor and bare condition of vicarages, many of

bells of the churches were never rung; the doors never opened. Parsonages were in ruins. It was in vain, however, at that time that Humphrey Arundell, the valiant Cornish soldier, rose in defence of the Faith, in that wild western country, and in the name of some hundreds petitioned for an immediate restoration of the abolished Mass; for the ancient rites and the Old Religion. In Berks, Hants, and Oxfordshire* the people likewise rose in a fury to defend their parish churches;

which were of so small revenue, that abundance of parishes were utterly destitute of ministers, to assist the people in their serving of God, and to instruct them in spiritual knowledge for the edification of their souls. So that there was no small apprehension that in time a great part of the nation would become pagans. Besides, to render the condition of small livings more deplorable, the pensions that were due to religious persons, and allowed them for their lives when their houses were dissolved, seemed to have been by patrons charged upon their livings, when themselves ought to have paid them. And commonly poor ministers, when they came into livings, were burdened with payment of divers years' tenths and subsidies that were payable by former incumbents. There seemed now also to be some that put the Queen upon taking a new survey of all ecclesiastical livings, pretending that thereby the values of firstfruits and tenths would be considerably advanced to her, to the further oppression of the needy clergy." —Strype's "Annals," vol. i. pp. 512-513. Oxford: 1824.

* In this county the old families of Simeon of Brightwell, Dormer of Thame and Ascot, Davey of Dorchester, Wolfe of Haseley, Browne (afterwards) baronets of Kiddington, Curzon of Waterperry, Phillips of Thame and Ickford (Bucks), and many others were warm defenders of the Ancient Faith. At the close of Elizabeth's reign three distinguished priests,

so that the Commissioners on several occasions slunk away in fear and dismay, terrified at the intensifying opposition. But a recent Act against unlawful and rebellious assemblies* was speedily put into operation; and men were thus warned that the King, their sovereign lord, charged and commanded them to disperse themselves, and peaceably depart to their habitations and to their lawful business, under the pains and perils of the Act. If more than twelve persons assembled they were liable to punishment. Though they demanded a restoration of the old religion of their forefathers, and the rites and ceremonies of bygone times, of which they reasonably enough felt the loss, their demands were not only contemptuously disregarded, but they were at once tried as rebels, soon found guilty, and speedily enough "strung up,"—as the brief and expressive phrase stood,—as a punishment for their inconvenient and fanatical attachment to the Ancient Faith; and as a warning to others who might be secretly attached to it, that if they ventured actively to resist the innovators in authority they would similarly and sharply suffer.

Francis Harcourt, Anthony Greenaway, and Roger Lee, all belonging to knightly families of Oxfordshire, and all connections of each other, were in the forefront as regards their prayers and labours for Catholic Christianity.

* 3 & 4 Edward VI., cap. 5.

All this, of course, was well and accurately enough remembered on all sides. The issue was quite evident. Those who lifted up their voices for God and His Truth, knew plainly enough what they had to expect. The least resistance to constituted authority would at once merit the strictest and severest punishment. Judges and bishops prated about "the law"; while Justice was dethroned and True Religion was being strangled. And, though news travelled slowly in those days, when conveyances were lumbering, bridges were few, and roads impassable; yet the Lincolnshire gentlepeople and the sturdy yeomen of the Wolds knew too well what lay in store for them, if they should dare to oppose the triumphant policy of Elizabeth's chief advisers. The dark doom of the Abbot of Barlings, in the days of the first Pilgrimage of Grace, had not been forgotten; for, by the side of many a Lincolnshire hearth, when the days were drawing in, had been frequently recited the vigorous and stirring ballads which so properly commemorated that prelate's strong faith and noble self-sacrifice.

When, therefore, the high-principled adherents of the Old Religion had been silenced, either by imprisonment, fines, persecution, or expatriation; and when, for the sake of peace and quietness, the weak-kneed and cowardly were quite known to be unlikely to make any resistance; the work

of destruction, carefully planned, was most efficiently carried out in the diocese of Lincoln. All the ancient clergy of any note or influence had been put out of the way. Bishop Watson, the chief pastor of that flock, could do little or nothing but pray, and hope for better days; for he was safe and secure in prison. Nicholas Bullingham, one of the ministers who had been present at the inauguration of the new hierarchy, when Matthew Parker was consecrated, had been himself subsequently elevated to the episcopate in the month of January 1560, by Parker and others; and, having by the Queen's authority usurped the place of his betters,—come into the fold in fact by some other way,—now ruled at Lincoln, with the sanction and under the special and direct patronage of the Supreme Governess. If heresy be opposition to the Catholic Faith, and sacrilege be sinful, then Bullingham's words and tactics certainly merit an application of those terms to him. It would be a distasteful work of supererogation, condemned by the Thirty-nine Articles,* to set forth in detail the theological propositions by which Bishop Bullingham recommended his new gospel to the acceptance of the Lincolnshire peasantry. He and Jewell and Bale

* See Article xiv. "Of Works of Supererogation."

and Pilkington, with Sandys and Grindal, were the burning and shining lights of the new system, and the coarse-languaged Evangelists of another gospel. What took place under his rule in the work of what was styled "Reform"—comprised in a duly-recorded document of melancholy interest—will best be shown and more accurately apprehended than by any study of his "Decades," or by any perusal of his existing manuscript letters. No more frightful record of deliberate sacrilege and savage profanity could be found, either on parchment or paper, amongst the records of any civilized country.

This work of destruction was begun in 1566, under the special direction of Dr. John Aylmer, then Archdeacon of Lincoln, but eleven years afterwards, *i.e.* in 1577, Bishop of London. The various acts performed were not the result of a sudden burst of maniacal fury, on the part of an ignorant and brutalized populace, maddened by previous sufferings, or spurred on to violence and reprisals by unjust persecution; but they were deeds done calmly and coolly* at the express

* Mr. Edward Peacock thus thoughtfully writes:—"It requires an effort to place ourselves, in imagination even, in the same position of affectionate reverence for mere articles of furniture—silk and gold, brass and stone—as our forefathers; but let us remember that the vestments thus wantonly cut up into hosen and cushions, or made into costumes

direction of those who perhaps may have believed themselves in a special manner to have been the living agents of the incarnate Son of God; and who certainly were the appointed officers of a Royal Lady who, at her coronation, had openly professed the Catholic Religion, received the Sacrament of the Altar under One kind, and who had then solemnly pledged herself in the face of the nation to maintain the Ancient Faith.

for strolling players, were the solemnly blessed garments in which they had seen their priests celebrate the Great Sacrifice of the Catholic Church; that the altar-slabs thus used as fire-backs and bridges had been dedicated by episcopal unction and the relics of the saints, and had received the far higher consecration of being the appointed place whereon that same sacrifice was consummated; that the Rood was to them the visible representation of their God—of Him Who had died for them on Calvary, and Who, with hands, feet, and side pierced as they saw Him there, would, as they believed, come ere long in glory and terror to judge the universe. The bells that profane persons hung to the harness of their horses had been borne before the priest through many a crowd of kneeling villagers when the Blessed Sacrament was carried from its resting-place over the altar to the bedside of the sick and the dying. The banners, the hearse, the lights, and almost every article of the Church's furniture were connected in their minds with the solemn funeral services, which, in their plaintive melody, show forth more fully than anything else that is left to us the wistful longing of the faithful here for the kingdom where sickness and death, marrying and giving in marriage, and all other sorrows and joys of this phenomenal existence, shall have passed away.”—“English Church Furniture, &c.,” edited by E. Peacock, F.S.A., pp. 21, 22. London: 1866.

The destruction and desolation thus caused by authority, carried out in cold blood, with preparation, resolution, and success, can now scarcely be imagined; nor can the dead and miserable state of affairs, from a religious point of view, which speedily ensued be easily conceived. What had taken place in the diocese of Lincoln, as far as regards about a hundred and fifty parish churches, can still, however, be tolerably well realized from the careful study of a volume* edited with care and judgment by a very competent hand, and which is mainly the reprint of an original "Inventory of the Monuments of Superstition," the document referred to, preserved amongst the miscellaneous papers of the Episcopal Registry at Lincoln,—with interesting and copious foot-notes and most valuable appendices added.

It was not enough, as the manuscript in question so plainly shows, that the altars were ordered to be utterly taken down and destroyed,—which was done to the dismay and amazement of a large majority of the people, who were awe-struck by the punishment with which those were threatened

* "English Church Furniture, Ornaments, and Decoration at the Period of the Reformation, as exhibited in a List of Goods destroyed in certain Lincolnshire Churches, A.D. 1566." Edited by Edward Peacock, F.S.A. London: 1866.

who actively interfered in behalf of the ancient rites,—but the sacred cross-marked slabs, which had been duly blessed in God's Name, with consecrated chrism, were to be purposely and deliberately profaned. To lay them down in the church porch or middle aisle, so that the people on entering it were compelled to tread upon them, was not, in Archdeacon Aylmer's opinion, a use sufficiently "common" or profane; so certain of them were sometimes placed as steps leading to the nearest pig-stye, or even put to a more infamous and disgusting use—too disgusting to refer to more particularly: and this under the direct official authority of the Primate of England* and Dr. Nicholas Bullingham, the intruded "Bishop of Lincoln."

A mere brief abstract, with a few startling examples of what was actually done in detail, must now be set forth with care. For after a study of this, the romance-writers of the Reformation may henceforth write in vain. Most of the recorded inventories are alike, both in form and phraseology: the destruction being systematic and complete. Every trace of the Old Religion, its mystic sacrifice and solemn rites, was carefully

* "The churchwardens shall see that the altar-stones be broken, defaced, and *bestowed to some common use.*"—Injunctions of Edmund Grindal, 1571. London: William Serres.

removed; and the language employed relating to the ancient solemnities and their *ornamenta*, was violent, contemptuous, and coarse, as will be too clearly seen.

At Ashby, near Sleaford,* as may be read, the images of the Rood were burnt, and the altar-stones used to pave the church. At Aslacie “the Mass-books, the processioners, the manual, and all such peltrie of the Pope’s sinfull service, was made away, torn, and defaced in the second or third year of Our Sovereign Lady that now is.” The same was the case at Ashwardbie. Here “all the Mass-books and all books of Papistrie were torn in pieces, and sold to pedlars to lap spice in.” At Bardney, the old priest, Sir Robert Cambridge, had removed the service-books; but the candlesticks and other ornaments were broken and sold. The altar-stones of the church of Barkeston were put to profane uses, having been laid down in pavement at the town bridge, while the holy-water vat was turned into a vessel for milk. At Belton in the Isle of Axholme, a representation in alabaster of All Saints, with “divers other idolls,” were cut in pieces, burnt, and defaced. What the churchwardens

* For details see pp. 29–171 of Mr. Peacock’s important volume.

profanely call “ a sepulchre, with little Jack,”—*i.e.* the Blessed Sacrament,—had been smashed a year ago, “ but little Jack was broken in peces this yeare by the said churchwardens.” Here, too, the altar-cloths were said to be “ rotting in pieces in the bottom of a cheste.” At Bichfield, the torn-down altar-stones had been placed on Broad Bridge to bear up the bank. At Billingborough, the churchwardens certified to Bishop Bullingham that “ all the trumpery and Popish ornaments were sold and defaced, so that there remaineth no superstitious monument within our parish church.” The sacring-bell of Burton Coggles church had been given to William Eland, who contemptuously hung it by his horse’s ear. At Bomnie, the pix had been used for a salt-cellar; while at Botheby, when Archdeacon Aylmer held his visitation, the Rood-loft had been sold to one Richard Longland, churchwarden, who made a bridge of it by which his cattle might reach their pasture. The altar-stone was disposed of to Mr. Francis Pennell, who made a fire-hearth of it. At Braughton two pixes which held the Sacrament had been given as playthings to a child; while at Braunceton the altar-bread box of bone or ivory became the money-box of John Watts. Here Robert Bellamy bought two corporas-cases, “ whereof his wife made of one a stomacher for her wench,” and of the other, when

ripped up, a purse. The pix-cloth of this parish had been secured by John Storr, whose "wief occupieth yt in wiping her eies." These arrangements were sanctioned at Lincoln by the bishop and others on the 18th of March 1565. At Croxbie, when some plumber was mending the leads of the nave, and needed a fire for his work, the crucifix, and Our Lady, and St. John were thrown into it and burnt. Of the Rood-loft a Mr. John Sheffield, ancestor of the present Earls of Mulgrave, made a ceiling in his house; and of one of the altar-stones a sink for his kitchen. At Croxton, the tabernacle for the Blessed Sacrament was converted by some earnest Reformer into a dresser upon which to set dishes. Of one of the chasubles at Denton, a certain William Green made a velvet doublet; the sepulchre from the chancel John Orson turned into "a presse" for his own clothes. At Dowsbie the churchwardens had secured two suits of vestments, of which they made cushions and bed-quilts; while at Durrington it is thus recorded:—"Altar stones ij—one is broken and paveth the church, and the other is put to keep cattall from the chappall wall; and yet standeth edgewaies on the ground." At Gonwarbie, two copes and two chasubles were sold to a tailor, and a holy-bread basket to a fishmonger "to carrie ffish in"; while at Grant-ham, St. Wulfran's shrine was sold to a gold-

smith, and the proceeds devoted to the purchase of a "sylver Pott, parcell gilt, and an ewer of silver for the mynistracion of the holye and most sacred Supper of Oure Lorde Jhesus Crist called the Holye Communyon." Three altar-stones from Habrough Church were first broken, and one of them was then laid in the porch,* so that the people should be obliged to tread upon it on entering; while stepping-stones for man and dog at the churchyard stile, were made of the other two. The Vicar of Haconbie must have been a person somewhat deficient in piety and reverence. For the Rood here with Mary and John were burnt under his direction, as well as an elaborate reredos of alabaster, "full of images." The altar-candlesticks were also broken, two purple velvet vestments were cut up and made into cushions, while the vicar himself was foremost in his energy for such reform. Of the tabernacle veil he made a hanging for his own hall, of two

* These pages are being prepared for the press at the little village of Chearsley between Thame and Aylesbury, where the Buckinghamshire family of Francklin were once lords of the manor, and founded a chantry; and I find that one of the altar-stones, with its top downwards, placed as a step at the south porch of the church in Queen Elizabeth's reign, still remains. It measures four feet eight inches by two feet one inch, is nearly four inches thick, and is bevelled round its edge.

banner-cloths he made window-curtains for the vicarage parlour, and of an altar canopy of velvet he made himself a tester for his bed ; where, when awake, he and his lady, by due contemplation, with their eyes turned upwards, could constantly realize the practical advantages of the " Reformation." The holy-water stoup this religious and reverent divine deliberately turned into " a swine's trough." At Horblinge, the MS. service-books were sold to a mercer, who tore them up to wrap spice in ; the Rood-loft to a certain John Craile, who made of it a weaver's loom ; three altar-stones were used for swine-troughs and bridges ; while two old vestments were given to Richard Colson a scholar, who, it is on record, " haith made a player's cote thereof." The altar-stones at Kelbie are " defaced and laid in high waies and serveth as bridges for sheepe and cattall to go on ; so that there now remaineth no trash nor tromperie." At Langtoft, one altar-stone was placed at the bottom of a cistern, another was used in mending the church wall, and a third inserted in a fire-hearth. A bedstead was made out of the Rood-loft of Osbombie by John Audley—a member of an illegitimate branch of the baronial family of that name. At Market Raison the " Rood with Mary and John—with the rest of the idolatrous images belonging to the abominable Mass," had been burnt three years pre-

viously." The cross-cloth of Stallingbrook had been sold to some strolling players; that at Tallington the churchwarden, John Wright, took and hung up in his hall; an amice from Thorpe was given to a poor woman, with which to make a shirt for her child. At Thurlby the altar-stones were set up edgeways to make churchyard stiles. At Waddingham the banner-cloths and cross-clothes were made into coats for the children of strolling players; while at Welby what is styled the "linen baggage" is made into shirts and smocks. The high-altar stone at Witham had been placed at Mr. Haringtons's fire-back. At Wrought, in the Isle of Axholme, "the rest of such triflinge toyes and tromperie appertaininge to the popish masse and popish prelate was made away and defacid in King Edward's time."

In certain of the cases here detailed, no doubt many of the *ornamenta* noted as "stolen" were removed by devout people in the hope of seeing better times and another change, when they would be brought out again for use.* Many such, care-

* Mr. Peacock thus wrote:—"I should not have published it had I not felt that the text illustrated in no ordinary manner the spirit of the Reformation. There is nothing in the annals of the French Revolution more sickening to a Christian man than some of the entries in these pages. I did not point out in my 'Preface,' as I wished to write entirely without partizanship, the fact that from many of the

fully hidden away, have been from time to time discovered. A Lincoln antiquary* of taste and repute some years ago gathered a large collection of old vestments and fragments of hangings from different parts of the diocese.

Now, when it is remembered that Bishop Bullingham and Archdeacon Aylmer—under whose authority the frightful deeds thus put on record had been done—were not only perfectly in harmony with Queen Elizabeth, the Chief Ruler of the Church of England, but entirely at one with their episcopal and archidiaconal brethren of both provinces, it is clear that the work of destruction, carried out in the diocese of Lincoln, was in no manner peculiar; that it did not differ either in method or completeness with the same kind of

churches (*e.g.* Scotton, p. 135; Market Raison, p. 124, para. 8) things are said to have been 'stolen.' Surely these repeated entries imply that Catholic-minded persons removed the things to keep them from profane hands. I think that in many cases where the vestments are said to have been ripped up for bed-hangings, 'quishings,' &c., that the persons who did so only made believe to put them to household uses for the sake of saving them. The John Thimbleby (p. 108) 'wat haith defacid' a cope and a vestment was certainly a Roman Catholic. So, I think, were the Ffairfaxes mentioned under Langtoft (p. 111)."—Author's MSS. and Excerpts, "Letter from E. Peacock, Esq., dated 13th September 1866."

* The late E. J. Willson, Esq., F.S.A., whose son has inherited the collection.

work done in other dioceses ; and that what took place in that of Lincoln, just referred to, was likewise completed in every other diocese throughout the kingdom. Bishops Pilkington,* Sandys, Grindal, Overton, Meyrick, Bale, Bullingham, and Parkhurst, were each and all thoroughly agreed in their principles and course of action ; and in substituting the new religion which had been set up for the old one which had been deliberately and duly abolished by Parliament, (the adherents of which were being persecuted and extirminated,) they were only carrying out the obvious and avowed intentions of those state officials who had placed them in high ecclesiastical positions expressly to carry out the changes and so-called "reforms" resolved upon.

Of course to any English churchman of the Oxford school, the proceedings in question will no doubt be read with some pain. It is no easy task to show that the revived doctrines and Catholic

* Whittingham, Dean of Durham, under Pilkington, in his frightful excesses quite equalled the dark deeds of Bullingham and Aylmer ; for he made the stone coffins of the Priors of Durham, whom he termed "servants of the synagogue of Satan"—into swine-troughs, and the holy-water-stoups of brass, which stood within each of the doors of the cathedral, into vessels for ignoble uses in the kitchen of his house.—See "Machyn's Diary," p. 59, and Anthony à Wood's "Athenæ Oxon." vol. i. p. 195. London : 1721.

practices, now so largely current in every diocese of our beloved country, and, many of them, so generally popular, were utterly repudiated by the dismal prelates, whose violent and heretical language is so awful in itself and so disquieting to dwell upon; and whose destructive labours it is so distasteful to put on record. Men, who in a spirit of self-sacrifice now repair churches, cleanse the font, rebuild the broken-down altar of the Lord, beautify His sanctuary, adorn with pictured pane and mosaic representation the chancel wall,—who open their restored churches for the daily office; who—in the face of secular courts and senseless “judgments”—believe in baptismal regeneration, practise confession, pray for the departed, and have been led, step by step, to restore the Christian Sacrifice and Eucharistic adoration; and who, furthermore, look upon themselves, now clothed in sacerdotal garments, and standing facing the Crucifix at lighted altars, as sacrificing priests of the New Law,—can surely have but very little in common with the vulgar anti-Catholic bishops of Queen Elizabeth’s day, whose profane and awful words, when read at a distance of three centuries and more, make a reverent person shudder; and the dark record of whose blasphemies and active wickedness when calmly faced, sends a thrilling shiver through the heart of a Christian, and makes every decent

Englishman—unparalyzed by indifference and not choked by false Science—blush for shame that such officials ever belonged to so moderate and respectable an institution as the Church of England by law established, now appears.

The change for the better which in several respects has taken place of late years in this communion, as those external to it allow, is, in truth, little short of miraculous. In Queen Elizabeth's reign, the bishops and ministers, having only little to give, of course gave but little. But "to him that hath shall be given." The grace of baptism used aright merits more grace—the gift of contrition and the admitted efficacy of prayer. An imperfect knowledge of the Most High, duly made use of, merits more knowledge. That which is used for God's honour and glory is never squandered, and cannot be altogether lost. Nor are men, after they have known the grace of baptism, what they were before.

In the present day, some Englishmen frequently complain of the policy, principles, and action of the bishops of the Established Church under difficult circumstances, and when dealing with delicate and complex cases; and oft-times they complain without just cause; for, as a rule, those dignified officials are perfectly true to the duties imposed on them, and obedient and faithful to

their present Master—the British Public.* Too much independence should not be looked for from them. The water-spring can never rise above its source; nor, to use another simile, are grapes gathered from thorns. In the present day Her Most Gracious Majesty's bishops, notwithstanding their extraordinary but precedented Oath of Homage, are obviously far superior in character to those of Elizabeth, the first female Governor of the Church of England; for they are decorous, moral, and moderate. It is true that they are sometimes more active in defending the temporalities and position of the Establishment than the Creeds which it still professes to maintain,—in other words, some seem to value more highly their temporal than their spiritual trusts,—yet they are almost always active, well-informed, worldly-wise, and shrewd. No bishop of the times in which we live would, for example, think of marrying, or rather of taking into his keeping as mistress, the attractive spouse of a butcher, as did John Poynt; nor would any

* The reader who is curious to see how gradual, but certain, has been the change from the "Royal Supremacy," invented at the so-called "Reformation," to the "Supremacy of Public Opinion," may read with interest, and possibly with profit, an article on that subject in the "Reunion Magazine," vol. i. London: 1879.

modern Archbishop of Canterbury, as did Cranmer,—after the woman in question had obtained a divorce, and the amorous prelate was waiting to welcome her to bed and board,—publicly officiate at the questionable nuptials, and so seal his suffragan's happiness. Nor, in truth, would a modern Anglican prelate of the exalted rank of Archbishop Sandys, put up at an inn during his visitation rounds, and so far forget himself as to allow the wife of the host to be discovered in his sleeping-chamber during the darkness and quiet of midnight. With all their drawbacks and difficulties, therefore, English Churchmen have much for which to be thankful. What has been already accomplished may be reasonably regarded as an earnest of what it is still possible to labour for with zeal and credit, and it may be, after all, with success.

CHAPTER V.

A copy of the Bull of Pope Pius V., already duly published and set forth, was affixed to the door of the English Ambassador's house at Paris; and another was placed on the gate of the Bishop of London's Palace at St. Paul's, late at night on May the 24th, 1570, by John Felton, a gentleman of Southwark, and Cornelius Irishman, a priest. The former was tried for high treason at Guildhall on the 4th of August, and found guilty. His attachment to the Old Religion was evidently deep, earnest, and enthusiastic—as the risk he ran showed. Under the severest and most cruel torture, borne without shrinking, he absolutely refused to name his accomplices; he declined moreover to acknowledge that he had received the copy made use of from the Chaplain of the

Spanish Ambassador; he gloried in having thus promulgated the Bull, and asserted his perfect readiness to die a martyr to the Faith of his fathers. To the "heretical system," as he termed it, which the Queen and her advisers had set up, he professed his cordial repugnance; he declined, after the decision of the Pope, to acknowledge Elizabeth as his sovereign; but personally, as he asserted, he bore her no malice whatsoever, hoping that she would one day renounce her heresy and accept the Faith; while on the morning of his execution, August 8th, as a token and testimony of earnest sincerity, he drew a diamond ring of the value of four hundred pounds from off his finger, and sent it by the Earl of Sussex as an offering to the Queen.

Though she professed to despise the sentence pronounced by the Pope, and though her advisers appeared to treat it with the utmost contempt, it is tolerably clear that neither the one nor the others at all liked it; and it is perfectly certain that it was a cause of much suspicion, uneasiness, and alarm to both. Making it a subject of conversation with her ambassadors, she is said to have declared it to be an insult to all the European Sovereigns; and induced the Emperor Maximilian to get it withdrawn. The Holy Father, on being solicited to do this, at once perceived, as all but Cecil and his allies saw,

that the blow had been keenly felt. But before His Holiness could give any reasonable answer to the Emperor's request, he must first know whether Elizabeth acknowledged his authority. This was a preliminary and crucial point which could not be overlooked. Having procured intervention regarding the Bull, it might be presumed that she did. But to the definite question, "Does the Queen of England regard the sentence as valid or invalid?" he must have an unambiguous and reasonable answer. If Her Majesty looked upon it as valid, why did she not at once seek reconciliation with the successor of St. Gregory and the Patriarch of Christendom? If invalid, there was, of course, nothing to revoke; for, from her own standing-point, the act was null and void. The pitiful revenge, which, with written oaths and strong language, she had threatened, was altogether beneath the Pope's notice. As the Father of the Christian Family, and acting in His Master's Name, he had, as he remarked, only done his duty. If, therefore, the Queen did not repent, and alter her policy, events must take their course.

Her Majesty's advisers, therefore, lost no time in taking fresh action consequent upon the publication of this Bull. Parker, Grindal, and Sandys, judging from their advice, held that it was a matter to be treated with contempt; but,

whether this was their true and secret opinion appears exceedingly doubtful. Cecil certainly did not agree with them, but thought otherwise. For a local insurrection in Norfolk, in which Esquire John Throckmorton took a leading part, appeared to give some grounds for disquiet. On the 2nd of April, 1571, consequently, several fresh laws, most carefully and artfully framed, were duly and finally passed*; and such was the practical response made by the Queen to the Pope. Henceforth if any one called Elizabeth a heretic, or gave her the title of schismatic, or declared her to be an usurper or an infidel, he was liable to be charged with treason and punished. What the punishment for treason was no one was ever allowed to forget. Anyone introducing a Papal Bull into England was likewise held to be a traitor; and, if the fact were proved, the usual punishment followed. All persons who should, by writing or printing, dare to affirm that any one particular person was the heir of the Queen, "except the same were the natural issue of her body"†—a phrase of remarkable significance—

* Some propositions relating to persons who refused to communicate at the new service of the Supper were so extravagant, that, when certain peers complained of their tyrannical character, they were withdrawn.

† At one period most unpleasant rumours were afloat, amongst others a report that the Queen was likely to become

were to be imprisoned for twelve months for the first offence, and to suffer the penalties of *præmunire* for the second. Furthermore, if any English people were found sending over relief to their expatriated relations, who, because of the fury of the persecution and the impossibility of exercising the Catholic Religion at home, had gone abroad, very severe punishments at once ensued. Finally, those who went abroad without license, as well as those who had obtained written permission to go, were to return at once after a warning by proclamation, at the risk of forfeiting all their goods and chattels, and the profits of their lands during lifetime, to the Queen's use. Tyranny is no term with which to describe such proceedings. The darkest age of barbarism—when cruellest despots, without responsibility or conscience, governed undraped savages—could scarcely produce parallels to the policy of this fearful woman and her unprincipled advisers.

Her government was in fact a pure and simple despotism—a despotism of the darkest dye.* The

a mother. But Lord Leicester thought it his duty to write to Sir Francis Walsingham to inform him that the Queen's indisposition was but slight, and that the rumour in question was unfounded.

* Those who assisted in erecting this system, though continually condemning the proceedings of Bonner and others in Mary's reign, seem never to have been struck by their own

Court of High Commission and the Star Chamber Court were the principal instruments by which such alarming despotism was carried out ; and, if unpopularity met any man of rank or mark ; if, in the hearing of a spy of Cecil's, or of some long-eared and contemptible informer, he uttered a word or sentence which might be twisted and turned against him ; or if the Queen found him less pliant or obsequious than she thought he ought to be, he stood henceforth in the greatest danger of liberty or life. Both those who adhered to the Old Religion, and those who were for proceeding further along the road of Reform, alike suffered.

The Queen, jealous of the prerogatives and powers with which Parliament had endowed her, was resolved to make all her subjects of one religion—that which, mainly for state purposes, had been recently excogitated and set up. This bore a certain relation to the old, for some of the leading dogmas of Christianity were embodied in it ; but other doctrines which served to preserve a due balance, and which together made up a complete circle of Divine Truth, were rejected.

great inconsistency. Bonner, so unjustly maligned, was at least upholding and maintaining a system which was as old as the time of St. Austin of Canterbury, whereas the new institution of Cecil and Parker was of quite recent date.

The ecclesiastical somersault which Her Majesty herself had made between the Faith she professed to hold on the morning of her coronation and that in which she now appeared to believe, was a somersault which she expected all her subjects to be capable of taking, and ready to take.

The Court of High Commission enabled her effectually to carry out her plans, and especially to answer the Pope. By this she formally gave to certain prelates and state officers exceptional powers : their authority extending over the whole realm, and over all ranks and degrees from peer to peasant. These Commissioners were empowered to exercise a complete control over both the faith and opinions of all ; and, according to their discretion, to punish all men, in any way and by any method short of death. It was open to them to proceed against delinquents by law, if they thought fit ; but, on the other hand, if these Commissioners thought it desirable, they might employ imprisonment (without trial or conviction), the rack, or any customary torture, so as to obtain their desired ends. If any man was even suspected—no matter regarding what, where, or why—they were empowered, *ex officio*, to administer an oath to him ; by which, as they maintained, he was bound, as a good subject, to reveal his most inward thoughts, opinions, and convictions ; and not only thus to accuse himself, but his

nearest and dearest friend or relations, and this on pain of death. Such ingenious and frightful tactics opened the door to dark acts of injustice worthy of the heartiest reprobation. Moreover, whenever they pleased, these High Commissioners could fine and imprison men as and when they willed, without fear or rebuke. They claimed alike an absolute control over the souls and consciences, as well as over the bodies, lands, and monies of Englishmen,—and all this on the hypocritical and false plea that such a policy was essential for delivering their countrymen from a “slavish subjection to a foreign Prince and Prelate.” In the action of these courts nobody’s conscience was regarded, whether Catholic or Puritan; in fact, no one was expected to possess a conscience, and no mercy was shown to any who presumed to exhibit the least independence. Furthermore, no practical remedy for the existing evils seems to have been as yet devised, even by those called upon to suffer in patience and endure.

The nation at this period was in truth sick at heart. The old nobility could not act together, were jealous of each other, and had lost their influence. The new, ever so avaricious and grasping, cared little for the poor; and in turn were themselves cared not for by any of those beneath them. The abbey and church lands were now

theirs ; but their first thought was to make the most of their new possessions, and the poor were deliberately passed by. New notions were eagerly clutched at. Some of the nobility openly advocated change, and in certain cases did so with a lack of good breeding and a singular want of taste.* There was an almost universal restlessness of thought ; disorder everywhere reigned, and poverty was widespread. Men by hundreds rose of a winter morning who knew not how to sustain their ordinary wants during the day ; social misery increased, dissatisfaction was rampant. The successful thieves—for this is what they were—who had ennobled themselves, or induced the Queen to make them peers, had ruder imitators in the lowest ranks of the people ; who, if they could obtain success in no other manner, became cut-purses and highwaymen. For them, under the new order of things, Might was Right.

Take, for example, one well-known case. Dr. John Storey, a distinguished civilian who in King

* The Duchess of Suffolk, wife to Mr. Peregrine Bertie, a renowned Protestant, had had a small rochet and chimere (the domestic dress of a bishop) made for one of her poodle dogs, which, in contempt for the Bishop of Winchester, she put on the animal's back, with its fore-legs in lawn sleeves. The dog itself she was polite enough to name "Gardiner."—See "Memoir of Peregrine Bertie, Eleventh Lord Willoughby de Eresby," &c. London : 1838.

Edward VI.'s reign had done all that lay in his power to oppose the changes in religion; and who, under Queen Mary, had been commissioned to see that the Rood and its attendant images, with a figure of the patron saint of every church, had been restored, was now to suffer death. He had done this good work of reparation and restoration so energetically and enthusiastically, that the innovators—no bad judges of who were their friends and who their enemies—held him in particular abhorrence. The earlier reformers had often singled him out for special abuse; for he had frequently exposed their heresy and self-seeking, had drawn a most powerful contrast*

* The contrast has been vigorously drawn in recent days by Mr. J. A. Froude, though his conception of the Catholic religion and Catholic practices is as inexact as it is queer. Some assertions he makes, if made in earnest, are exaggerated caricatures, altogether unworthy of a writer of history:—"The Catholic believed in the authority of the Church; the Reformers in the authority of Reason. Where the Church had spoken, the Catholic obeyed. His duty was to accept without question the laws which councils had decreed, which Popes and bishops administered, and, so far as in him lay, to enforce on others the same submission to an outward rule which he regarded as divine. All shades of Protestants, on the other hand, agreed that Protestants might err; that Christ had left no visible representative, whom individually they were bound to obey; that religion was the operation of the Spirit on the mind and conscience; that the Bible was God's Word, which each Christian was to read, and which, with God's help and his own natural intelligence, he could not

between the Old Religion and the New, and was exceedingly plain-spoken and zealous for the Faith. On Queen Mary's death he had prudently withdrawn to the Netherlands, where he received an appointment in the local Custom-house. There he was often brought into contact with English merchants. On one occasion—evidently by previous arrangement with the authorities at home—he was seized bodily, when searching an English vessel, and brought by force to England. Though guilty of no transgression save that of self-expatriation, so that he might observe without let or hindrance the religion of his forefathers, he was at once put into confinement in the Tower*; and at the age of seventy

fail to understand. The Catholic left his Bible to the learned. The Protestant translated the Bible, and brought it to the door of every Christian family. The Catholic prayed in Latin; and whether he understood his words, or repeated them as a form, the effect was the same, for it was magical. The Protestant prayed with his mind, as an act of faith, in a language intelligible to him, or he could not pray at all. The Catholic bowed in awe before his wonder-working image, adored (!!) his relics, and gave his life into the guidance of his spiritual director. The Protestant tore open the machinery of the miracles, flung the bones and ragged garments into the fire, and treated priests as men like himself."—Froude's "History of England," vol. vii. pp. 23, 24. London: 1863.

* On the walls of the Beachamp Tower the inscription, no doubt cut with his own hand, still remains, thus:—

1570 : IHON . STORE . DOCTOR .

years cruelly executed. The Oath of Supremacy* was at once tendered him; but he refused to take it, as contrary to his faith and conscience. Neither argument nor threat could move him. He had never had a doubt that such a she-supremacy—the acceptance of which it was endeavoured to impose upon him—was both ridiculous and profane; and no inducements held out of a few more years of life (he had already reached the appointed threescore years and ten) could lead him for an instant to alter his noble determination. He was consequently condemned to be drawn, hung, dismembered, disembowelled, and quartered; and thus, his punishment deliberately prolonged, the poor old man suffered. When cut down from the hanging-post alive—an important

* “Bishop Burnet acquaints us in his ‘History of the Reformation’ that Queen Elizabeth scrupled at first very much to accept the Supremacy. And well she might. For she could not but know herself unqualified by her very sex, even for the lowest degree of any ecclesiastical dignity or function. Yet she accepted it, and discarded the Pope, as her father had done before her, though upon a different motive. For Henry did it to be revenged of the Pope; but Queen Elizabeth’s motive was ‘because she knew very well,’ says Dr. Haylin, ‘that her legitimacy and the Pope’s supremacy could not stand together.’ So that although her policy was not quite so bad as her father’s, it was mere policy and interest of state that determined her to this capital article of her Reformation, and the considerations of religion had no part in it.”—“England’s Conversion and Reformation compared,” p. 302. Antwerp: 1725.

part of the sentence—he is said to have struggled with, and struck, the executioner, who was drawing out the bowels from his ripped-up and bleeding body; but of course Storey, wounded, maimed, and half-strangled, was soon overcome; and groaning heavily, then died for his Religion and his conscience in excruciating agonies.

Thus men of independence and vigour, the grey-haired as well as the hale and lusty, were put out of the way. It needed a firm faith in the unseen world, and a full reliance on the Almighty's promised help in time of need, to enable them thus nobly and calmly to meet death. God grant that, if the valley were shadowy and dark for such sufferers, the land beyond was fair and peaceful and bright to their disembodied souls!

But even this bloody method failed of its purpose. Uniformity was never attained; divisions, as will be seen, steadily increased.

Dr. Bonner, Bishop of London, whose dignity and revenues had been usurped, died a prisoner in the Marshalsea on the 5th of September 1569. He was unpopular because he had taken an active part, in Mary's reign, against the innovators; and various writers have united in his condemnation. But exceedingly little has ever been produced to show that the popular conception of this prelate's character and actions was either just or true. Moreover, those who live for the sake of

popularity frequently get exceedingly little for their pains. In sowing over-abundantly they often reap but very sparingly. Bonner was more than once offered his liberty if he would change his religion; but he died as he had lived, a consistent man and a good Catholic, preferring to the smile of the present World the welcome of his Master and the eternal joys of the world to come. He was buried at nightfall in the churchyard of St. George's, Southwark.*

Bishop Thirlby—the only predecessor of Cardinals Wiseman and Manning in the see of Westminster—died at Lambeth Palace, where he had been confined for eleven years, on the 26th of August 1570, and was buried, without Catholic rites, in the midst of the choir of the parish church of Our Lady of Lambeth.

It should here be noted that many principles which those who had formed the new Church had entirely put out of consideration in constructing

* Bishop Sandys thus wrote to Cecil:—"Dr. Bonner had stand excommunicate by a sentence in the Arches' eight or nine years and never desired absolution. Wherefore by the law Christian sepulture might have been denied him; but We thought not good to deal so vigorously, and therefore permitted him to be buried in St. George's Churchyard. And the same to be done not in the day solemnly but in the night privily."—Bishop Sandys to Sir W. Cecil, 9th Sept. 1569, "Remains of Archbishop Sandys," p. 307. Parker Society.

it, were at once true and important; and some of these were very soon seized upon and adopted by the Puritan leaders—many of whom were laborious scholars, and, though sometimes pedants, men of rare ability. The inherent truth of such principles and their obvious reasonableness, insured them both respect from the populace and acceptance; while in some instances they were received with enthusiasm. An “Admonition to Parliament,” presumed to be from the pens of Wilcox and Field, two Puritan divines, who lectured at Wandsworth, contained the bitterest language against the new Church, and was greedily bought up and read. Whitgift on the side of the Establishment, and Cartwright on the Puritan side, both engaged in controversy concerning it. Long sermons and longer controversies were at that time all the fashion. This particular controversy lasted no less than six years. At its end neither batch of disputants seemed to be wiser than at the beginning. At Cambridge, one Charke, a preacher, was also anything but complimentary to the new hierarchy. It is true that as a body they were a very commonplace lot, with no higher notion of their office than that they were state officers,—perhaps, after all, a not inaccurate estimate,—yet, when this university divine maintained that “Satan had introduced bishops, archbishops, metropolitans,

patriarchs, and popes," neither Dr. Matthew Parker nor Dr. Edwin Sandys could have been exactly flattered. The polite and impressive language they had so often applied to the Holy See and its occupants was now in turn applied to themselves. Nemesis had arrived sooner than was anticipated. When, moreover, the Puritans* taught, for instance, that the Church ought always to be independent of the State, they only recommended an obvious truism; for Cæsar has nothing to do with the things of God. When, again, they maintained that women could have no part in Church government, except to listen, learn, and obey, they knew themselves to be supported on that point both by apostolic teaching and by universal precedent throughout Christendom. Here they and the Pope were at one. This doctrine, therefore, they constantly declared in private, and often preached in public. The Su-

* They objected altogether to bishops and specially to the superiority of bishops over other ministers. With them all preaching-ministers were alike. They also disliked the Ecclesiastical Courts (as in subsequent times they had the best reasons for doing), the "vain repetition" of the Lord's Prayer, and the existence in the Table of Lessons of any parts of the Apocrypha. They objected to the use of the sign of the cross in baptism; to the ring and the words of betrothal in marriage; to the observance of festivals; to the chanting of Psalms; to the use of organs or other musical instruments; and, above all, to the habits—the surplice, silken hood, cope, rochet, and chimere of the ministry.

preme Governess of course did not approve of such homilies, and swore when she heard of their delivery. But whether Her Highness liked them or not, the Puritans continued to preach on. As a consequence, divisions multiplied, and new sects were born.

As a maintainer and defender of these principles one remarkable man stood in the forefront, and for some time gave considerable trouble to the authorities. Thomas Cartwright, born in Hertfordshire, about 1535, received his education at St. John's College, Cambridge. In Queen Mary's reign he had withdrawn from making preparation for the ministry, and for a while made his living as a scribe. On Elizabeth's accession, however, when the tide had turned, he went back to Cambridge, where he was elected a Fellow of Trinity College; but, being disappointed of further promotion, as some have asserted, went off to Geneva, where he cordially accepted the Calvinistic theories, in all their logical sharpness and terrible conclusions; and then returned in 1570, when he was made Margaret Professor of Theology at his own University. The controversy concerning clerical vestures was then raging furiously and being conducted with vigour,—in which he took a leading part against them. But he carried his controversy with the Queen's new Church still further. He was opposed to bishops themselves,

their incomes, courts, and officers, as well as to their lawn rochets and satin chimeres; and in due course, because of his ability and plain-speaking, was soon looked upon as the head and leader of the Puritan party—a party patronized by Lord Leicester. Thus the new bishops were not only compelled to face and receive the controversial fire from Dr. Allen, Stapleton, and others, who for several years had so ably and consistently maintained the Ancient Faith, but were now likewise taken in the flank by the racy and raking arguments of Cartwright and his allies. They were thus between two fires.

The policy and method of Cartwright in appealing to this or that text of Scripture, or in quibbling and arguing about antiquity, entirely took the wind out of the sails of the Establish-mentarian prelates. They knew not what to say. If one controversialist could appeal to the Bible, so could two, or twenty, or two hundred, and why should they not? They each did so. No one could determine the controversy. No one could finally decide it. Private judgment untrammelled and unchecked had come in. Authority had been turned out. Thus confusion became worse confounded.* Babel was being painfully rebuilt.

* Eventually the ministers themselves admitted as much. "Because that is generally known throughout the whole

Again, this honest and out-spoken Puritan was highly incensed at what he looked upon as the pompous state and extravagance and good living* of the bishops: "He is much offended with the train they keep," are Parker's own words of complaint to Lord Burghley, "and saith that three parts of their servants are unprofitable to the filling of the Church and Commonwealth; and he is very angry with their furniture of household."† All this annoyed and mortified the Archbishop greatly, who, whatever he may have been, was very modest in his opinion both of his personal and official powers. For he thus implored Lord Burghley to induce the Supreme Head to step in and settle the dispute concerning the value of episcopacy:—"Sir, because you be a Principal Councillor, I refer the whole matter to Her Majesty and to your order. For myself, I

Citie (of London) that no one parish or parson can agree together, & that the cause thereof is the privatte readinge in houses. . . . we humbly require that these readers may be forbidden and some straight punishment for this great and horrible sin may be appointed, or else the preachers hereafter commanded to hold their peace."—Address of the London Clergy to Convocation, A.D. 1580.—MSS. of Anthony à Wood, No. 8494, fol. 30, Bodleian Library.

* "Tin cupps for the Supper suffice; but my Lord of Durham now hath them of gold for his lady and impes."—"A True Protestacion," &c., p. 31. London: 1575.

† Lansdowne MSS., Brit. Museum, No. xvii., folio 93.

can as well be content to be a parish clerk as a parish priest. I refer the standing or falling altogether to your own considerations, whether Her Majesty and you will have any archbishops or bishops, or how you will have them ordered.”

The abject and humiliating position of this great official—this first Protestant archbishop—thus set forth in his own words, could not possibly be more abject or degrading. He has evidently no principles to maintain, and therefore none to resign. But he is even ready to sacrifice his office, as well as himself,—to give up the whole question of episcopacy (which with him evidently could have been no question of principle),—if the Head of the Church, the new She-Pontiff, and her Principal Secretary should in their infallible judgment decree that His Grace ought to do it. In this Parker proved himself a worthy successor to Thomas Cranmer.

That prelate, who, twenty-six years previous to Elizabeth's accession, had first stood forward to make a breach with the Holy See, and who, to his earthly king and patron, had proclaimed himself ready at all risks and at any cost to act independently of his legitimate Patriarch, bore a heavy responsibility upon his shoulders. Where he had passed, others, like Parker, were ready to follow. The acts of Cranmer at his consecration

had been so bold and unprincipled, and at the same time so adroit and well-suited to the temporary purpose of the King his master, that all the complex and miserable evils which have afflicted this nation since—the final separation, with division subdivided by division—may in truth be traced upward to the frightful sacrifice of principle perpetrated when this wretched man became Archbishop of Canterbury.

In truth, no one acquainted with the facts of his true history has presumed to deny that he was a despicable character; and that the only noble act he did was at the close of his life, when he appropriately let his right hand first suffer at the stake, because it had been the instrument by which a degraded and corrupt mind had wrought out so many evil deeds. His notorious obsequiousness to his successive masters, Henry, Seymour, and Dudley, was only equalled by the barbarous cruelty exercised by him upon the various obstinate and wrong-headed sectaries who, from time to time, found themselves in his power. In one respect this archbishop is distinguished from all other persecutors, even from pagans, in that he not only actively promoted the capital punishment of those who disagreed with him in religion, but of those likewise who agreed with him in it. In Henry's reign, for example, he took a leading part in bringing to the stake Lambert, Anne

Askew,* Frith, and Allen, besides condemning many others to the same awful punishment for denying a bodily presence of our Lord in the Sacrament of the Altar. Under King Edward,—the Calvinistic child who was the pliant and pietistic tool of others,—Cranmer had secured the conviction of Arians and Anabaptists—two of whom, Joan Knell and George Van Parr, he actually caused to be burnt, personally preventing the King from pardoning the poor wretches, by authoritatively and unctuously assuring him that “princes being God’s deputies, ought to punish impieties against Him.”†

But to return to the method by which the new Church was practically ruled—a point of great practical moment. For many persons now-a-days hold that what they term “recent innovations” ‡

* At the church of Snodland in Kent, there is, or was when the author visited it about eighteen years ago, a highly-coloured and most impressive stained-glass window, of all the tints of the rainbow, in which certain of the Reforming bishops are represented, above the Communion-table, in the most gorgeous Eucharistic vestments—“the garments of Babylon,” as they would have termed them. In one of the lights is a highly idealized representation of Cranmer; in another—with somewhat of inconsistency, not apparent doubtless to those who put it up—a representation of this very “Anne Askew” whom he had brought to the stake.

† “Burnet’s History,” Part II., book I.

‡ The existence of the Privy Council as the Final Court of Appeal in spiritual questions, for example; the abolition of the Arches’ Court and the Chancery Court of York; the sub-

had no place in the pure conception and perfect scheme of the "Reformers,"—a remarkable delusion, utterly contrary to historical facts; totally opposed both to the policy of the Queen and the unvarying practice of each of Her Majesty's prelates.

The Church of God, as we all admit, was ever governed by her lawful authorities, the bishops; the Church of England from its first creation by the Reformers was ruled by Royal Commissioners, who settled its constitution, arranged its Prayer Book, sanctioned and legalized its Ordinal, and managed its temporal affairs. These, with a few exceptions, were laymen, some of them lawyers, others needy gentlepeople who had apostatized, or "new men" of base birth and low origin, who had already risen from the ranks by servility, want of good principles, and by intrigue; and who reasonably desired to rise higher, and secure more of the good things of this world by fresh deeds which will not bear the light of day. Their scheme of setting up a local church which they could mould, alter, and dominate as they willed, was a master-stroke of state-craft. But it was also mischievous, wicked, and wrong. "God's

stitution of a new Parliamentary Court for the whole of the two Provinces; and the setting up, by statute, of a new and non-spiritual Judge.

mill grinds slowly." At length, however, some—waking from a deep sleep, stretching out their hands, yawning with a will, and rubbing their eyes—begin to see the situation as it *is* (not as it *seemed* to them in their rosy dream), and are now too accurately realizing what was done.

Elizabeth's Commissioners, of whom Archbishop Parker was chief, were to make strict inquiries concerning all erroneous, heretical, and dangerous opinions. They were to find out who were absent, Sunday by Sunday, from the Church services, as well as those who frequented the private prayer-meetings and preachings of the Puritans. They were to give their best endeavour to suppress all heretical and seditious publications; all anonymous and other libels and squibs, then becoming numerous,* against the Queen, and her officers both of Church and State, and if possible to get hold of both writer and printer, and nail their ears to the pillory, or cut them off; they were, moreover, to deal with all adulteries, bigamies, fornications, and other offences against the ecclesiastical law—which had enormously increased—and

* It was made felony "to write, print, or set forth any manner of book, rhyme, ballad, letter, or writing, containing any false or seditious matter to the defamation of the Queen's Majesty or to the encouraging of insurrection or rebellion within the realms."—Statutes of the Realm, vol. iv. p. 659.

to punish the offenders with so-called "spiritual censures."

Catholics and Puritans alike both suffered.

In 1571 two Puritan members of Parliament, Strickland and Snagg, boldly proposed to amend the Prayer Book in a Protestant direction; but they were soon put down. The Queen, as Supreme Governness, maintained, accurately enough, that such proposals struck at the very root of her prerogative, as no doubt was the case; and that she, as Head of the Church, being alone charged with the care of it, distinctly forbade Strickland to go forward with the measure. At first he declined, and was pardonably sulky over the question; but, on being warned of the consequences of his resolution, and having been brought before the Privy Council, he was most arbitrarily and illegally forbidden to attend the House at all.*

* Her Majesty's arbitrary action on this occasion was severely commented on. Some said that as Parliament had made her the Head of the Church, she was obviously inferior to Parliament, and must abide by its decisions. On the other hand the prompt action she took in the case of Strickland, if justifiable with one member of Parliament, might subsequently have been applied to all. The Puritans were furious, and considerable sensation was created. Besides such action as that recorded above, the Queen interfered personally in the election of members of Parliament. In Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire she sent written orders to those known to favour the innovating section, to see that her

This strong measure, however, was more than the Commons chose to allow to pass unchallenged. They, therefore, protested, and Strickland soon took his seat again.

In the meantime, those who were directly affected by the issue of the Pope's Bull, found themselves in still greater straits. Foreign Catholic sovereigns with their hands full of troubles and responsibilities of their own, had apparently allowed its promulgation to pass unnoticed; while, amongst those of the Old Religion at home, there had at once arisen serious dissensions with regard both to its terms and its object, as well as to its immediate effects. Some maintained that it had been irregularly and unauthoritatively issued. Others argued that no one was bound to take action upon it, until the Chris-

allies, and those who would actively support them, should alone be elected. Amongst such were Sir Henry Lee of Quarrendon; the Cheynes, a knightly family of Drayton Beauchamp and Chesham-Bois; and the Packingtons of Aylesbury; all connections by marriage, and all more or less of a Gallio-like type. The long disfranchised borough of Galton was at that period notoriously under the influence of a certain Madam Copley. But this lady had not repudiated the Ancient Faith, and was consequently held to be "not well-affected." So the Queen gave directions that Madam Copley's nominees should be passed over, and only "loyal" men returned. See Loseley MSS., and Author's MS. Excerpts.

tian nations of Europe had first determined upon accepting it in combination, and of actually putting it into practice. Argument, as experience teaches, is often easier than action.

While opinions thus differed, and nothing was done, it became tolerably evident that the innovators did not intend to be at all checked or circumscribed by any such action. Cranmer, by his laxity regarding oaths, had some years previously taught how an Archbishop of Canterbury might become entirely independent of the Pope; and the Queen's advisers, having accurately and perfectly learnt their lesson, applied the principle involved in it with boldness and spirit. Having first repudiated the Pope, they then abolished the Christian Sacrifice.* In so doing, they were independent of every existing authority, being amenable

* In the abolition of the Christian Sacrifice, Protestantism and Mahometanism appear to stand on a level. In the recommendation of penance and self-denial, however, the latter apparently has the advantage of the former. Here it may be noted that one of the Queen's leading bishops is profane rather than witty (as he evidently intended to be) in the following pedantic and laboured paragraph regarding the Mass:—"How many toys, crossings, blessings, blowings, knockings, kneelings, bowings, liftings, sighings, houslings, turnings and half-turnings, mockings, mowings, sleepings, and apish playings, soft whisperings and loud speakings, have we to consecrate our own devices withal, or [*i.e.* before] it can be gotten done!"—"Pilkington's Works," p. 498, Parker Society. London: 1842.

to no one, and superior to all. In action they were wholly unchecked by any considerations of what might be said in criticism—a position scarcely conceived of now-a-days when Public Opinion owns such an extended, and, in some cases (where Prejudice does not come in) beneficent and advantageous influence.

When, therefore, to say Mass was to be guilty of high treason,* and to hear Mass, of felony,—each offence punishable with an infamous death, it certainly behoved all those who could take a broad and wide view of the position to be prepared for some kind of action, unless the Faith were to be actually allowed to die out. Of course

* “Treason, by the law of England, and according to the common use of language, is the crime of rebellion or conspiracy against the Government. If a statute is made, by which the celebration of certain religious rites is subjected to the same penalties as rebellion or conspiracy, would any man, free from prejudice, and not designing to impose upon the misinformed, speak of persons convicted on such a statute as guilty of treason, without expressing in what sense he uses the words, or deny that they were as truly punished for their religion as if they had been convicted of heresy? A man is punished for religion, when he incurs a penalty for its profession or exercise, to which he was not liable on any other account. This is applicable to the great majority of capital convictions on this score under Elizabeth. The persons convicted could not be traitors in any fair sense of the word, because they were not charged with any thing properly denominated treason.”—Hallam’s “Constitutional History of England,” Sixth Edition, vol. i. p. 164, note.

penal laws, like the enactments referred to, could never change the nature or essence of things. They could not make certain actions, for the punishment of which these laws had been specially passed, to become crimes in the sight of God and man, if they were not so before. Murders, treasons, and rebellions, great and acknowledged sins, have generally been punished with death; but can any reasonable being—can any person in his right mind, assert that to say Mass was a sin at all, or a sin of a like dye, or had ever before been looked upon as such, or that it merited a similar punishment? The most holy and sacred Mass was simply the august sacrifice of the New Law, instituted by Our Divine Lord Himself, and offered to Almighty God day by day, from east to west, in all preceding ages, and in every Christian kingdom, from the foundation of our holy religion to the period in question. Is it credible, then, that, as in other Christian countries, all the bishops and priests of Great Britain through a period of nine hundred years, should have been guilty every morning of committing a crime, equivalent in its punishment to that for murder or rebellion? * The very notion thus stated,

* Some of the more daring innovators persisted in maintaining that all "Mass-mongers," as they termed the old clergy, because of their office, were "conjurers." The Pro-

though absurd enough, suffices to prove that the enactment of these sanguinary statutes,—executed for generations, and some of them remaining as laws of the land within the memory of those still living,—was one of the blackest stains on Elizabeth's character.

The direct consequences of such legislation have already been only indirectly hinted at, though some few have been plainly set forth. In the latter portions of this Sketch of the Church under Queen Elizabeth, certain dark deeds which resulted from that legislation, will be duly put on record. With several writers they have been deliberately kept in the background.

Before the result of the recent legislation against recusants is considered in detail, it is necessary to glance for awhile at another part of

testant bishops in their sermons had deliberately encouraged this kind of language, with profane epigrams about "Hocus-pocus." For example, Grindal, when Bishop of London, wrote to Cecil on April 17, 1571, alluding to the examination of Cox *alias* Devon, an old priest who had been taken that day. The Council, the bishop hopes, will surely punish him for his magic and conjuration. Devon, it appears, had said Mass at the house of Sir Thomas Wharton, of Newhall, Essex; at Sir Edward Waldegrave's; and at Stubbe's, in Westminster. On the 19th, the Earl of Oxford encloses to Cecil "An Inventory of all such implements of superstition as were found in the chamber near Lady Wharton's bed-chamber at Newhall, Essex," after the pursuivants had ransacked it.

the picture, and to note certain obvious features in the new order of things, which, by way of contrast, may better enable the reader to take in exactly what had been done.

Many of the new clergy were zealous in their labours, and had little disposition to let their moderation be known unto all men. For, as it was mainly the over-zealous and fanatical who had been promoted to high places since the Queen's accession; so fanaticism and over-zeal, held to be the highest virtues by those who expected promotion, were often rampant.

Just as the Queen's first Parliament had been packed with "good men and true,"—that is with persons known to Cecil as favourable to his designs and a change in religion,—so likewise had the two Convocations of the English Provinces. When those clergy who on principle had resisted the innovations, had either resigned, been imprisoned, or expatriated, there were no great difficulties in manipulating the elections for proctors. The deans and other officials were, of course, all of one way of thinking; and every care was taken that the representatives of the chapters and parochial ministers should be of a like stamp, and in harmony with them, as far as harmony could be looked for.

As early as the year 1562, the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, clearly indicating

its "reformed" character, had formally made requisition to the bishops, firstly, that "no person abide within the Church during the time of the Communion, unless he do communicate: that is, they shall depart immediately after the Exhortation be ended, and before the Confession of the communicants"; and, secondly, that it be added to this Confession that "the communicants do detest and renounce the idolatrous Mass." *

Deacons—whether distinct from "readers" does not appear—on their being licensed were expected to promise as follows:—"I shall not openly intermeddle with any artificer's occupation, as covetously to seek a gain thereby, having in ecclesiastical living the sum of twenty nobles or above by year," †—a position which, from some documents consulted, it is tolerably clear that no ordinary "reader" could have held.

The furniture now needed for the churches, but not always supplied, consisted of a font, a pulpit, a table (*i.e.* a board), some tressels, a large Bible, and a Prayer Book each for the parson and clerk. John Fox's "Book of Martyrs"—a volume of controversial misrepresentations and falsehoods, which still stands without a rival—

* Strype's "Annals," vol. i. p. 508. Oxford: 1824.

† *Ibid.*, p. 515. Oxford: 1824.

was specially ordered to be procured and left open in some side aisle, in order that all might read its gross and wicked assertions, illustrated by rude but thrilling and effective wood-cuts, and so swell the ranks of the innovators. The Queen's "Injunctions" and the "Paraphrase" of Erasmus likewise had to be procured by the churchwardens, together with the two volumes of savoury "Homilies," recently published, for the non-preaching ministers to read out to the people.

The parish clerk, who in out-of-the-way places* was no doubt conservative enough, and no great promoter of change (for change was not likely to benefit him much), went on the even tenor of his way, as of old, making as few practical alterations as possible. In many places, as at St. Just's in Cornwall, Wincanton in Somersetshire, Thame in Oxfordshire, St. Margaret Pattens in the City of London, and at St. Edmund's, Bury St. Edmunds,† he still wore the accustomed linen

* Mass was said in several remote parishes, throughout the whole of the reign of Elizabeth, *e.g.* at Morwenstow and Lanherne in Cornwall; at Stonor Park, Oxon.; at Thame Prebendal House Chapel; at Waterperry House; at Wing in Buckinghamshire; Nash Court in Kent; Raglan Castle; and in many parish churches in Lancashire, where the local nobility and gentry connived at such breach of "the law": in some places even unto the period of the Great Rebellion.

† Author's MSS. and Excerpts.

rochet—sometimes without sleeves, as more convenient. No doubt he continued likewise to observe many of the ancient traditional rites and ceremonies, not specified by any printed or written direction, as a matter of course; to ring the bells as of yore, marking peal from chime,* the clang of the marriage-bells from the solemn toll of the great bell for funerals. It was more probably his pious custom to begin and end all services, regular or occasional, with the sign of the cross; to strike his breast at the Confession; reverently to cover his face with his hands at the *Miserere* as usual†; to respond as of old at baptisms and churchings; to have the cross borne at the head of a corpse at funerals; and, generally, to sever as few as possible of those traditional threads‡

* In hundreds of country parishes throughout England and Wales, the Mass-bell is still rung on Sunday mornings at 8 o'clock, though there be no service held of any sort or kind.

† The fact that these traditional observances were forbidden in the later years of Queen Elizabeth, by her bishops in their "Visitation Articles," shows, by implication, that they were still practised in some places.

‡ As late as the first year of James I., one Howell Thomas was buried openly in the parish church of Caerleon, with all the ancient rites. Father Robert Jones said the Funeral Mass early in the morning, after which a large concourse of persons, hooded and bearing lighted tapers, preceded the corpse to the burial-place. The ancient offices seem to have been used, for no minister was present, while at the close of the

which both in church and churchyard linked so firmly the living with those who had worshipped there in the past, and who now slept their last sleep beneath the green grass, under the shadow of some old church tower.

Except amongst the upper classes and the more prosperous tradesmen and yeomen, the people seemed to have still buried their dead, when interred in the churchyard green, in a shroud and winding-sheet, without coffins. Most of the nobility and gentlepeople owned vaults in the churches or chantry chapels, and were buried

funeral ceremonies, one Lander ventured to predict that Mass would soon be said publicly again.—“State Papers, Domestic, James I.,” vol. xiii., 52A, A.D. 1603. Even later than this public feeling was so strong on the subject of the burial of the dead, that an attempt at excommunication on the part of the Minister of Allesmore near Hereford, was completely defeated by force. It seems that a devout Catholic woman died; but, as the old rites had been used in her sickness, the minister maintained that she was excommunicated, and could not be interred in the churchyard. The clerk dug a grave, but the minister ordered it to be filled in again. The body remained unburied for more than eight days. At length her neighbours determined to inter the corpse. So they rose early on the appointed day, and with torches, tapers, and the ancient ringing of bells, they boldly went to the churchyard and peacefully effected their object. The minister had appealed to the Bishop, who sent his officers to take the people into custody; but the number of Catholic sympathizers so increased, that this was out of the question, and serious riots were feared.—See “Treatise on Mitigation,” by Robert Parsons.

with exceeding great heraldic pomp—strictly according to their true and recognized rank. Of this the heralds took especial care, for they duly marshalled the procession, formally sanctioned the coat-armour put up, and were not unrewarded as regards fees. The clergy likewise by custom were commonly interred in the choirs or chancels, and often, as of old, with their feet towards the west. In these cases leaden and oak coffins were always used. But the large majority of persons during Elizabeth's reign were evidently buried without coffins. The long winding-sheet was folded again and again round the stiff body, after which it was bound closely with swathings of clean and white linen, with a frill both at head and foot; then placed on a bier, or sometimes in a parish coffin kept for the purpose, over which during the funeral service a wooden herse stood, commonly covered with a silken pall.

In certain dioceses, as in that of St. David's, already referred to, some young and vigorous bishop—"a mightie proper enemy to the Pope and all his fond and pernicious tromperie"—had done his best to crush out all Catholic customs, and to destroy reverence and decency; but in others, and specially in that of York—where the wolds were wild, the parishes extensive, and the country population scattered; and, perhaps, mainly because parsons were scarce, and ministers few in

number—the parish clerk, retaining his old duties, was duly authorized by the Primate of England * not only to read the First Lesson, but to monotone the Psalms at Mattins and Evensong, and to recite the Epistle in the monthly or quarterly service of the Lord's Supper. In some cases, when no minister was to be had, the clerk appears to have churched the women, catechized the children, and buried the dead. †

Here and there, especially in certain large towns, well-meant attempts to preserve to the newly-arranged services some kind of order and decency were sometimes made. So long as former traditions survived this was not so impracticable. But such services were not popular; the churches had fallen into such decay—there were broken windows around, damaged roofs above, and damp pavements beneath—that the people failed to attend them, save under pressure from authority, and fear of punishment for being absent. Thus week-day services ceased, and only

* The clerk, at least in the diocese of York, was expected to be both able and ready to read distinctly the First Lesson, the Epistle, and the Psalms, with all the ordinary responses, and to keep the church clean, swept, and sweet. Whether he was ordained at all, and if so by what form, is uncertain. The old clerks had almost always received the four minor orders.—Archbishop Grindal's "Articles to be enquired of," &c. A.D. 1571. London: William Serres.

† Author's Excerpts and MSS. Elleker Letters, No. 17.

Sundays came to be at all observed. For then lists of all absentees were made out by churchwardens and sides-men, who stood at the chief entrance with ink-horn, pen, and paper, and once a quarter lists were returned to the diocesan authorities. In newly-founded grammar schools, however, and in alms-houses, some kind of prayers, usually a modification of Mattins and Evensong, were almost always enjoined to be said daily—to the credit of their founders.

Loose doctrines continued to be taught with regard to the need and nature of episcopacy. Whatsoever the Pope was believed to maintain as true and necessary, that (whatever it might be) was still openly opposed, caricatured, and condemned. Yet when the ultra-Puritans became potent, those in authority in the Established Church, were obliged to shift their ground a little. Bishop Pilkington of Durham, for example, remarked—"I agree that James, brother of Our Lord, was bishop there at Jerusalem, as the ancient writers testify; but that he said or did anything like the Popish clouted Latin Mass, *that* I utterly deny."*

Elsewhere the same Protestant authority wrote:—

"In all these ages were some that both knew,

* "Works of Bishop Pilkington," p. 496, Parker Society. London: 1842.

taught privately, and followed the Truth; though they were not horned and mitred bishops, nor oiled and sworn shavelings to the Pope. Such Popish bishops I am sure no man is able to prove to have been in every see of this realm continually since the Apostles' time, nor elsewhere. When he has proved it, I will say as he does."*

Confirmation, no longer a sacrament, but only a mere rite,† in which the subjects confirmed themselves, was then looked upon by the great majority as most probably a work of supererogation, and was in no way appreciated. Hence very few confirmations were held anywhere; for, in truth, nothing approaching a ceremony—unless the Queen were the chief subject of it—was now tolerated, much less run after. When Apostles could bestow a power of speech to the stammering or stupid, or when to those preaching to

* "Works of Bishop Pilkington," p. 598.

† "The *rite* of Confirmation, as I desire to point out, is something altogether different to the *Sacrament* of Confirmation. The latter is as old as Christianity, administered both in the East and West, whereas the former, the 'rite,' was first invented by the English Reformers. It is, as we all know, a service in which persons make a promise in the face of the congregation 'to ratify and confirm' the pledge made on their behalf by their sponsors—a very impressive service; a kind of 'renewal of vows.' But this is not a sacrament, as any bishop of the Established Church would frankly and passionately maintain."—Sermon by the Bishop of Dorchester, O.C.R., reported in the "Daily Chronicle," September, 1878.

strange nations, (as some remarked,) a special "gift of tongues" was thus imparted, laying on of hands was all very well. But when nothing visible ensued—as was certainly then the case—it became merely an empty and idle ceremony. Long sermons or wearisome "prophesyings," as they were termed, were then all the rage. What were termed "theatrical displays" * had quite gone out of fashion. When, therefore, Dr. John Underhill in 1589 was sent to Oxford, as bishop, this interesting rite had not been administered for more than a quarter of century †; and when an obscure person, named John Jegon, was appointed to the see of Norwich in the spring of 1603, there had been no confirmation in that part of the country for the space of twelve years. ‡

It was a long time before the people became accustomed to wedded bishops and parsons' wives.

* "With respect to Confirmation, I do not suppose you approve of the theatrical display which the Papists have admitted among their sacraments. But, if those who rightly instructed in the Catechism, are admitted to the Lord's Supper with public testimony and imposition of hands (which we know that Christ also practised to young children), I do not see what occasion there is for any one to quarrel about it."—Rodolph Gualter to Bishop Cocks, Letter 94, Second Series Zurich Letters.

† This melancholy fact is apparent from documents existing in the Diocesan Registry at Oxford.

‡ "A Replicacion to an Auncient Enemy," &c., p. 31. London: Serres.

Several smitten and insinuating prelates who had made offers of marriage to the daughters of knights and esquires, were cruelly repulsed; and this sometimes even when the watchful *Paterfamilias* was himself an innovator, and “most godly and worshipful.” Sir John Harington records some notable incidents relating to this subject; and it is well known that for several generations after the changes under Elizabeth, the inferior clergy had to be content with the pink-faced and fresh daughters of husbandmen, with “serving-maids,” or, as a doubtful alternative, with “ancient widows.”

When Dr. John Whitgift was Bishop of Worcester (A.D. 1577–1583), though the revenue of the see was not very great, he always came up to Parliament well attended—his servants in purple liveries and staves of office, his ambling nag caparisoned with a richly embroidered saddle-cloth, his chimere of new and shining satin, and his lawn-sleeves perfectly clean and undarned—a fashion much gone out, because many of the prelates were so miserly, and consequently so shabby; but one which was greatly liked by the Queen.* It happened one day that Bishop Aylmer of

* “Brief View of the State of the Church of England,” by Sir J. Harington, p. 8. London: 1653.

London, meeting His Lordship of Worcester with such an orderly troop of attendants, demanded of him how he could afford to keep so many men, upon which Whitgift answered, with a sharp twinkle of the eye and a smile, that it was because he kept so few women.

The distracted bishops, pulled hither and thither by controversial partizans, were now so troubled by the Puritans that formal Injunctions were issued in the summer of 1571, forbidding reading, praying, preaching, or administering the Sacraments* in any place, public or private, without license. This was certainly needed, if anything approaching to order was to be retained; and was not determined on a day too soon, for the disorder then existing was of so remarkable a kind, that, to some, it seemed likely to be subversive of all peace, either in Church or State, and threatened to produce anarchy. A sermon, in those days, instead of ending with a devout for-

* Unless a man could preach fluently without a manuscript, the Puritan leaders doubted if he were "called," though possibly "ordered." "As for those unlearned ones, whom you call, neither are they ministers, though you so term them; neither have authority to minister sacraments, though you give them power, except they can minister the Word by preaching also."—"An Answer to Certain Pieces of a Sermon made at Paul's Cross, by Dr. Cooper, Bishop of Lincoln." London: 1572.

mula, often closed amidst controversial expostulations and noisy assertions, and sometimes ended with a free fight. A parsimonious Chelmsford churchwarden* who, on one occasion, had provided a certain amount of wine for use at some religious commemoration (let us hope it was a love-feast, and not "the Supper" of the Prayer Book), had the empty flagon thrown at his head, because he had not supplied sufficient for the spiritual wants of the militant and excited "saints." Such disorders were by no means singular. The Act of Parliament† which had been passed in the spring of the year had already gone as far as it was possible to go in conciliating these wandering preachers and communistic prophets. Probably a full third of the beneficed clergy were either, (1), only "readers" or old parish clerks; (2), persons who, when abroad, had received a "call" from some of the foreign sects, or who had been "ordered" by a minister"‡;

* "The Brownists of Chelmsford," &c., by a Congregational Minister, p. 37. Chelmsford: 1821.

† Statutes, 13 Elizabeth, cap. xii.

‡ "One Badam, an old worn-out minister of Gloucestershire, deprived of all living by the Superintendent of Hereford [*i.e.* John Scory, bishop] for his lewd conversation, and among the rest *for making ministers for money*, without his lordship's knowledge, &c."—"An Ancient Editor's Notebook." Library, Stonyhurst College. From this it is clear that an old minister [neither bishop nor priest] simoniacally pretended to make "ministers."

(3), persons who had been appointed preachers by the Superintendents of Foreign Protestants in London, Sandwich, Canterbury, Dover, Norwich, and elsewhere; or (4), old men who, either in religious houses or as seculars, had, in previous reigns, received minor orders and the office of the sub-diaconate or diaconate; or (5), persons who, believing themselves "sent," and repudiating forms and ceremonies, had never been ordained at all. Enquiries which some of the bishops had carefully made, convinced them clearly enough of the true state of affairs; and, as it was quite impossible by any existing legal machinery to turn out at least one-third of the persons beneficed, amounting to no less than three thousand, it was clear that what could not be cured must be endured. Complaints had long been made that anybody and everybody who believed himself to be under the guidance of the Spirit,* insisted both on praying and preaching in parish churches as well as by market-places and on village greens. Persons of the humblest class, and with no attain-

* The "farmers of benefices" were quite content to employ such persons, because their services could be secured for a small payment; and, consequently, seldom enquired about "ordination." The Bishops' Courts, moreover, granted all kinds of dispensations, from which considerable fees were received.

ments,—some could only read with difficulty, and often stumbled much in reading at all,—came forward on their own authority to curse the religion of their ancestors, with impressive oaths and terrible language, to interpret the mystical imagery of the Apocalypse in a sense “disadvantageous to the foreign Bishop of Rome,” and at the same time, as some reason for their astounding dogmatism, to maintain the certainty of their own predestination to eternal life, and their sure guidance from on high. As regards “reforms,” those already carried out by the Spiritual Governness, Parker, and Cecil, were not worthy of the name. Instead of having had one Pope, of old, all the new prelates, as it was maintained, now wanted to be themselves Popes; they wore the outlandish garments of Babylon, fined and persecuted “the saints” (as the Puritans modestly called themselves), cited them to their courts, where legal sharks abounded, and steadily resisted that further “godly reformation,” which was still, as they argued, so sorely needed. When Archbishop Parker summoned Sampson and other Puritan leaders to Lambeth, His Grace soon found out how fanatical and disobedient they were, and how entirely exhortations to conformity were contemptuously disregarded.

It was determined, therefore, to allow all those who were in possession of benefices,—whether

ordained or not, and whatever they were, whether laymen, ministers, or priests,—to retain their respective preferments by simple subscription to such of the “Articles of Religion” of 1563 “as only concern the profession of the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the Sacraments.” Conditional ordination was never even contemplated. With the same aim, certain words of the twentieth Article, viz. “The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith,” were somehow omitted in a new edition of these Articles which Jewell, Bishop of Salisbury, had prepared for publication; and this with the express intention of more effectually smoothing the path of the Puritans, and of avoiding further contests or agitation. Such, however, was never secured. For agitation was still carried on, and contests were more frequent than ever. The large concessions already made to the Puritans were of course accepted. And, be it noted, they were no sooner accepted, than fresh agitators began at once to demand further and still greater changes.

The chief point, however, which should never be forgotten by those who look back on the past, but of which few are really aware, is that, at the period referred to, the question of the necessity of episcopal ordination was settled, at the distinct suggestion of the bishops themselves,—with the

pontifical authority of the Supreme Governess herself, and by and with the consent of Parliament,—in the plain sense of its *not* being necessary at all. Thus the loose and lawless opinions of Cranmer, Barlow, and Bale, concerning ordination, were not only commonly current throughout the new Church, but were actually approved and ratified by this new and special enactment; formally confirming those whose ordinations were avowedly questionable, doubtful, or invalid, in the full, free, and peaceable possession of their respective benefices.

Were the solemn warnings, let it here be asked, of Bishops Thirlby and Scott, of Abbot Feckenham, and Bishop Watson, uttered in all solemnity on Queen Elizabeth's accession, but utterly disregarded, the warnings of the lawful teachers of the Church of England,—not greatly needed when, in less than twenty years, such a complete revolution could have been thus effected?

Alas for the poor of our crowded cities! Alas, too, for the poor scattered over the wealds and wolds of our dear old England,—robbed thus of their brightest heritage, the Faith of their Fathers: offered henceforth, in lieu of the promised Bread and a foretaste of the peace up above, only the discordant wranglings of dreary disputants, and—a stone!

What has already and hitherto been set forth

will serve to show how thoroughly the work of destruction had been done. Not only had the people of England been cruelly cut off from communion with the rest of Christendom—against the will of a large majority, and obviously without the knowledge of what was being done, on the part of a still larger; but all religion was being deliberately corrupted and destroyed,* and all authority weakened.

Those who for their own selfish purposes had set to work to make a new Church for the English people, may possibly have done their best, in the process of its being first planned, then arranged,

* As Mr. Mossman has acutely observed:—"The position taken up by the English Church at the time of the Reformation was that a national, or local, or particular Church has a right to sit in judgment upon the Church Universal: that a part of the Church has a right to decide for herself whether or not the doctrines which she has hitherto held in common with the whole Church Universal are true or false, and accept them or reject them accordingly; a right to decide whether or not the Canons of the Church Universal are in accordance with the laws of Christ and His Apostles, and abrogate them, or establish them accordingly; a right to decide for herself, as against the rest of Christendom, which Sacraments were ordained by Christ, and which were not; and a right to decide finally what ritual and ceremonies of the Church are lawful and edifying, and so to be retained; and what, on the other hand, are unlawful and unedifying, and so to be rejected, as tending to superstition and idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."—"The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: a Sermon." London: 1879.

then manipulated anew, altered again, reformed afresh, and still made dependent, weak, and un-influential; but the lesson they all so entirely forgot,—a lesson which is more than ever needed at the present day,—is that “all power” has been given to the Son of Man on Earth as well as in Heaven; that He has mercifully delegated that power to be exercised for the benefit of all races and nations to His One Universal Church, and that no local Communion, isolated and apart, can in its sinful isolation convey the full benefit of God’s royal gifts to any.

The authority of prince as well as prelate, indeed, comes from the same divine source—God Almighty; and this is true, though now rejected by those who think themselves wiser than their forefathers. Furthermore, the destruction of one, as the experience of Christians teaches, ensures the certain weakening of the other, and *vice versâ*. It can cause no surprise, consequently, that, when the old and legitimate Christian authority of the Holy See was rudely abolished in England, all authority became weakened; or that, in due course, it was discovered that the destruction of the Altar under Elizabeth had directly led to the overthrow of the Throne under Charles I. Putting aside the question of a she-supremacy, the monstrous and impracticable doctrine that children should rule their parents, and subjects their kings,

that a disjointed rabble, excited by godless self-seekers and political fanatics, may lawfully and properly set aside both Patriarch and Prince, as and when they will, and as often as they like, is a doctrine which more than any other has tended to bring about that alternate disorder, confusion, mistrust, and revolution by which the once Christians of Europe are now in these latter years of Civilization, Culture, and Progress, periodically cursed. The most influential modern Evangel is obviously the gospel of the Gatling-gun—the glad tidings of Fire, Sword, and Force. The so-called “progress” of once Christian races turns out to be only the impressive progress of a crab—their culture, a mere knowledge of how to pamper the body, paganize the mind, corrupt the conscience, and starve the immortal soul.

END OF VOL. I.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Recently published. One Volume, post 8vo., 440 pp.,
cloth, 10s. 6d.

HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF THE REFORMATION.

Opinions of the Press.

"These clever, outspoken pictures of men and things He writes with spirit and freshness about scenes and concerning men whom many readers know scarcely more than by name, and has many things to say which so-called 'Protestant' Historians are apt to slur over or omit. The chapter on the death of Richard Whiting, the Abbot of Glastonbury, is one of the best in the volume, and will amply repay careful reading."—*Standard*, 13th January 1879.

"Contains much interesting matter. The style is uniformly good, and the stories of the Pilgrimage of Grace, and of the death and burial of Henry, are well and graphically told."—*Spectator*.

"The whole of the chapter on the Martyrdom of the Charterhouse Monks is well worth reading, and not only this, but indeed the entire volume The object of the book is well sustained throughout. The writer steadily keeps in view the end which he proposes to himself as desirable."—*Tablet*.

"Much that he writes about the tyranny and wickedness of Henry VIII. is very just—as for instance in the executions of the Monks of the Charterhouse and the death of Abbot Whiting of Glastonbury. The stories of those horrors and of the Pilgrimage of Grace are both truly and graphically told."—*The Academy*.

"Almost all of them are powerfully and vigorously drawn. They contain, for the most part, the history of sad and dark deeds, and excite a feeling of sympathy with those who suffered We have read the book with a considerable degree of interest, which will be shared by those who care to know about some of the Ecclesiastical movements in the past history of our country, and at the same time to be acquainted with one of the most prominent forms of religious thought in the present day."—*Leeds Mercury*.

"Dr. Lee's valuable work is calculated to dispel much of the ignorance of the real character of the Reformation, which historians for various reasons have fostered, and to throw light on the darkest pages of English history. Let us hope, also, that it may do its part towards restoring that Unity which the Reformation destroyed."—*Weekly Register*, November 1878.

"I must at once bear testimony to the literary force and power of the book. It is a series of historical stories which show on every page of them the dramatic instinct of their author. One is carried along by the narrator to the catastrophe. Nor does he gain his effects by cheap sensational novel-writing; nor, I believe, with any intentional disregard of truth."—*Western Morning News*, 2nd November 1878.

Opinions of the Press—cont.

"A volume, written very temperately, in which the long-suppressed facts concerning Tudor tyranny are set forth and commented upon by an unsparing hand Will be sure to make its mark, for it is intensely interesting, and, though solid, most readable."—*Berks Advertiser*.

"The account of the sufferings of the Monks of the Charterhouse, which, as Dr. Lee here sets it forth, will be new to most of our readers, is written with a graphic power and picturesqueness quite out of the ordinary run."—*Kentish Observer*.

"It is certainly quite time that Englishmen should know that the great revolution in religious thoughts and practices, which is generally known as the Reformation of the sixteenth century, was not accomplished by means which are altogether above suspicion. There were on the Protestant side some violent men and some unjust deeds. These men and their deeds it is sometimes thought to be the duty of Protestant historians to attempt to justify or pass over altogether. But such a course is manifestly unwise; we can do nothing for truth by suppression of truth, and Protestants as well as sympathisers with Rome ought to be thankful to have the truth told on a side which has not always done justice to it. For reminding us of this simple act, which, truism as it is, some of us have too often forgotten, our thanks are due to Dr. Lee."—*Liverpool Albion*.

"We have not come across so thoroughly readable a book for years. Whatever may be thought of its principles, there can be no doubt that the accomplished author can write brilliantly and forcibly, and that he has drawn some powerful pictures of the Reformation with picturesqueness and much graphic ability."—*Daily Post*.

"Picturesque and graphic; here and there brilliant."—*Windsor Express*.

"A most opportune and valuable work One sure test of the ability of the author, and of the interest of the work itself, is the power it exercises over the mind of the reader. We opened this volume, and the interest which it excited induced us not to read it at a sitting, for that would be impossible, but to make it our constant companion until we had completed it."—*Westminster Gazette*.

"It is the spirit, rather than the bare facts, of Dr. Lee's sketches which we are forced to condemn as unhistorical."—*Saturday Review*.


"Very readable, being composed with considerable literary skill."—*Church Bells*.


"Written in an easy, readable, and somewhat slashing style We go a long way with Dr. Lee in his compassion for Elizabeth's Roman Catholic victims."—*Church Times*.

"It professes to be historical, but its claim to such a title is simply ludicrous; and the style is so poor that it hardly reads like the production of an educated man."—*Rock*.

"It is a way (?) of writing which Dr. Lee has;—a flower of rhetoric culled from the New Cut at Lambeth."—*John Bull*.

"In religion as in politics, few footsteps are retraced. But Dr. Lee is a man not to be daunted by danger or difficulty; and even where we disagree with his conclusions, we must respect the unflinching courage with which he wages the conflict and bears the brunt of battle. The talent of the author and the interest of the subject-matter of the work are evidenced by the fascination which this book will be found to exercise over the reader. The author can hardly hope that it will convince in every case, but we feel sure that few readers will commence the perusal without reading the book from cover to cover. This is largely owing to the dramatic skill of the author in painting for us these scenes of the past. No man is more thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the men of three centuries and a half ago than Dr. Lee. He is not of the nineteenth century. Neither his virtues nor his faults are those of the present day. His 'Sketches' are those of a pre-Raphaelite in the most literal sense of the word."—*Morning Post*.





BW5125 .L47 v.1

The church under Queen Elizabeth.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00017 6901